



# **North West Preston Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document**

## **Consultation Statement**

***March 2017***

## CONTENTS

<b>Para</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>A</b>	The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012	<b>3</b>
<b>B</b>	Evidence base and initial Masterplan public consultation (2013-2014)	<b>3</b>
<b>C</b>	Summary of issues raised in the 2014 draft Masterplan consultation	<b>4</b>
<b>D</b>	From approved planning guidance (Feb 2014) to draft SPD (July 2016)	<b>4</b>
<b>E</b>	Summary of issues raised in the 2016 draft SPD consultation	<b>5</b>
<b>F</b>	From draft SPD (2016) to adoption (2017)	<b>6</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	
	<u>Appendix 1</u> How the NW Preston Masterplan SPD has evolved – Timeline of key dates/changes.	<b>7</b>
	<u>Appendix 2</u> Key issues raised in the 2014 Masterplan consultation and how they were addressed.	<b>9</b>
	<u>Appendix 3</u> A copy of the 2016 SPD consultation letter.	<b>11</b>
	<u>Appendix 4</u> The 2016 SPD consultation online questionnaire questions.	<b>13</b>
	<u>Appendix 5</u> Key issues/changes made to the Draft Masterplan SPD as a result of the 2016 public consultation.	<b>14</b>
	<b><u>Appendix 6</u></b> <b>Schedule of Representations: Summary of each response, and how the key issues were considered/addressed in the final (2017) Masterplan SPD.</b>	<b>16+</b>

**A. THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012**

1. This statement has been prepared in accordance with the above regulations and in particular, Part 5, which relates to the progression of Supplementary Planning Documents to adoption.
2. Public participation is covered within the Regulations at paragraph 12. Before a local planning authority adopts a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it is required to prepare a statement setting out:
  - i) the persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the Supplementary Planning Document;
  - ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
  - iii) how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.
3. In accordance with the above regulations, this statement sets out details of the initial consultation that took place in relation to the North West Preston Masterplan SPD, and how the consultation process has informed the development and refinement of the document. This includes details of how, when and with whom this consultation took place; the main issues raised; and how these issues have been addressed in the document put forward for adoption.
4. A timeline of the key dates and changes, showing how the Masterplan has evolved to its current SPD format put forward for adoption, is shown in **Appendix 1** to this statement.

**B. EVIDENCE BASE AND INITIAL MASTERPLAN PUBLIC CONSULTATION (2013-2014)**

5. The masterplanning exercise was informed by a 'baseline' review of the North West Preston area by URS (Final Baseline Report, North West Preston, dated August 2013). This set out the strategic context and need for the Masterplan and is available on Preston City Council's website at the following link:  
<http://www.preston.gov.uk/masterplan>
6. The reason for the City Council seeking adoption of the NW Preston Masterplan as an SPD is to supplement Policy MD2 of the adopted Preston Local Plan (adopted in July 2015). Policy 1 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CS adopted July 2012) had already identified the North West Preston area as a strategic location for growth, and in the interim period a supporting document was considered necessary to assist developers in the preparation and submission of planning applications in the area.
7. In May 2013, consultants URS were commissioned by the City Council to commence work on producing a Masterplan for the NW Preston area. The Masterplan continued to evolve through close working with all stakeholders including Lancashire County Council (Highways and Education), local residents, landowners, and developers.
8. An original area appreciation and issues workshop was held with the key stakeholders (including residents and developers) in June 2013 and three potential options were prepared for the Masterplan which were subject to public consultation in July 2013. A preferred option was then outlined, which was subject to public consultation in November 2013 and the Masterplan was subject to a further four week period of public consultation by the City Council in January/February 2014 prior to being approved as LPA planning guidance in February 2014.

9. A detailed account of the Masterplan consultation process prior to the 2014 consultation, including comments received, responses to these comments, and resulting changes to the Masterplan, are set out in the 2013 Masterplan Consultation Statement (prepared by URS, dated December 2013). This 2013 Consultation statement is available for download on the City Council website on the aforementioned weblink (above).

### **C. SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED IN THE 2014 DRAFT MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION**

10. In the four week period of consultation for the Masterplan undertaken between January 2014 and February 2014, 99 responses were received to the Masterplan document, of which a number were multiple duplicates, leaving a substantive number of 82 responses. Of those, 43 were from local residents, 21 were from developers/landowners, 9 were from local authorities including local councils and the Local Enterprise partnership, and 9 were from statutory bodies. The majority of responses included multiple comments on a range of matters. In total approximately 300 comments were made in the 82 responses. The main issues raised in the 2014 public consultation are outlined below:

- East West Link Road
- Preston Western Distributor
- Broughton Bypass
- Infrastructure - Transport
- Infrastructure – Phasing
- Infrastructure – Foul Drainage / sewers / Surface Water drainage / flooding issues
- Infrastructure – Health
- Infrastructure – Education
- Infrastructure – Retail
- Infrastructure – Green/Blue infrastructure / biodiversity, and leisure
- Infrastructure – General
- Status of Masterplan
- Viability, Land ownership / land assembly
- Effect of development on existing residents
- Masterplan phasing
- S106 / CIL
- Garden City Approach
- Construction phase
- General Housing comments
- Amendments to Masterplan text / mapping issues
- Power lines
- Consultation issues
- LDF / Evidence Base issues / relationship to the LDF
- Safeguarded Land
- General comments

11. In response to the comments received in 2014, a series of further amendments were made and the Masterplan was approved as planning guidance by the City Council in February 2014.

### **D. FROM APPROVED PLANNING GUIDANCE (FEB 2014) TO DRAFT SPD (JULY 2016)**

12. The City Council, in partnership with AECOM (formerly URS) continued to liaise with the key stakeholders including Lancashire County Council, landowners and developers, predominantly through a series of workshops spanning the latter part of 2014 and early 2015. As a result of these workshops the content and form of the Masterplan continued to evolve. A summary of the key issues and changes that were made to the Masterplan as a result of the 2014 draft Masterplan consultation is shown in **Appendix 2**.

13. Taking into consideration the main issues raised in the 2014 consultation, the Preston Local Plan was adopted in July 2015. This paved the way for an (updated) Masterplan to be adopted as an SPD to supplement APLP Policy MD2: North West Preston. Whilst Policy MD2 sets out the vision and the infrastructure required in North West Preston, the Masterplan provides further guidance as to how the Council would like to see this policy implemented.
14. In order to provide an even finer grain of indicative detail, two additional indicative documents were produced, comprising design guidance for development along the East West Link Road (produced by AECOM on behalf of the City Council) and guidance relating to the implementation and management of strategic green space (by the Land Trust).
15. Given the expanding content of the Masterplan, in particular the introduction of separate sub-documents to accompany it, the original Masterplan document was updated and condensed to make it more user friendly; this main document would now form just one sub-document within a suite of documents making up the draft SPD. In addition to the Masterplan, the draft SPD also comprised an overarching statement (to explain the context, the hierarchy of the SPD sub-documents and to link them together); the design guidance for the EWLR, and the strategic green space guidance.
16. In this revised format, the Draft NW Preston Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document was subject to a statutory consultation process between 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016 and 12<sup>th</sup> August 2016, in accordance with the Regulations. The consultation, including details of how and when to make representations, along with the draft SPD and supporting documents, were publicised on the City Council website and hard copies were made available to view at the Town Hall and Ingol Library during normal opening hours.
17. Numerous organisations/individuals were consulted, predominantly by email, and a number of posters were displayed within and adjacent to the Masterplan area. Two public drop in sessions were also held and were well attended. Consultees included statutory consultees, and various stakeholders including planning consultants/solicitors; housebuilders; businesses; charities; interest/action groups (including the North West Preston Community Liaison Group); local authorities; parish councils; city and county councillors; and government departments; etc. Given the list is extensive, it is not proposed to reproduce it in full within this statement. However, the full list can be supplied on application to the City Council. The consultation letter is included at **Appendix 3**.
18. Respondents were asked to give their comments, preferably via an online questionnaire. The website questionnaire questions are shown in **Appendix 4**.

## **E. SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED IN THE 2016 DRAFT SPD CONSULTATION**

19. In total 44 responses were received to the 2016 draft Masterplan SPD. These included representations from local residents, developers/landowners or their representatives, statutory bodies, and City and Parish Councillors. Some were relatively short and dealt with one issue, whilst others were very lengthy and included multiple comments on a wide range of matters, including general, specific, and site-specific issues. The key issues raised are identified as follows:
  - Principle/ Policy context / legal status of Masterplan as an SPD;
  - Ownership of, and mechanisms for, the delivery and implementation of the key infrastructure including trigger points, phasing/timescales, conditions/CIL and S106, viability and deliverability, and equalisation mechanism for compensating landowners (Delivery and Implementation Plan, etc);

- Highways issues, transport and access including inconsistencies with LCC EWLR application, highway capacity issues (Tabley Lane in particular), and provision of cycling routes, etc;
- Local centres including location, definition, hierarchy, and number of local centres, and impact on Cottam District Centre;
- Green infrastructure/open space including parks/green buffers, land under the pylons, and highway verges;
- Foul and surface water drainage and SUDs;
- General design principles/guidance;
- Heritage/archaeology;
- Residential amenity;
- Other (more minor) issues e.g. size/colour of SPD docs, and minor tweaks to maps/annotations and text etc;
- Site specific issues from landowners/developers: including: extant permissions, provision and location of community infrastructure and equalisation (eg need/location/detail of schools/main local centre, etc).

#### **F. FROM DRAFT SPD (2016) TO ADOPTION (2017)**

20. As a result of comments received to the 2016 Draft SPD public consultation, further meetings were held with the key stakeholders including developers/landowners to discuss the main issues raised, and a series of further amendments were made. The key issues/changes made to the Draft Masterplan SPD as a result of the 2016 public consultation are shown in **Appendix 5**.
21. A Summary of each response, and how the key issues were considered/addressed in the final (2017) Masterplan SPD are shown in the Schedule of Representations in **Appendix 6**.
22. Aside from minor tweaks to the Masterplan document, a key issue raised by a number of developers was in relation to the delivery and implementation of the required community infrastructure, including viability/deliverability issues, and a fair and equitable mechanism for equalisation. An additional supporting document is currently being produced in the form of a NW Preston Delivery Plan (to supersede the previous Delivery and Implementation Plan (DIP) which was undertaken by consultants URS in January 2014).
23. Another issue raised was clarity of the hierarchy of SPD sub-documents. To this end, the guidance “Proposals for Strategic Green Space: Implementation and Management” (by the Land Trust), previously intended to form part of the suite of SPD documents as Doc 04, will no longer be an SPD document, but will still provide useful background/information.
24. As amended, the revised NW Preston Masterplan put forward for adoption comprises the following:

<b><u>SPD Documents:</u></b>	
<b>SPD Doc 01</b>	<b>SPD User Guide / Overarching Statement</b>
<b>SPD Doc 02</b>	<b>The North West Preston Masterplan (including indicative Framework Map) – The Main Document</b>
<b>SPD Doc 03</b>	<b>East West Link Road (EWLR) Corridor Design Guidance</b>
<b><u>Supporting documents</u></b>	
<b>Delivery and Implementation Plan (in preparation / under review)</b>	

## APPENDIX 1

### How the NW Preston Masterplan SPD has evolved – Timeline of key dates/changes

- **July 2012** – The Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CS) is adopted. Policy 1 identifies North West Preston as a strategic location for growth.
- **May 2013** – URS are commissioned to commence work on the Masterplan on behalf of the City Council.
- **June 2013** – Key stakeholders including residents and developers are invited to attend an Area appreciation and issues workshop.
- **July 2013** - Potential options for the Masterplan are subject to public consultation.
- **August 2013** – URS publish Final Baseline Report.
- **November 2013** - Preferred options are subject to public consultation.
- **December 2013** – URS publish Community & Stakeholder Consultation Statement, and Health Impact Assessment.
- **January 2014** – URS publish Transport Assessment, and Delivery & Implementation Plan.

The final draft of the URS Masterplan is subject to a four week period of consultation, orchestrated by Preston City Council. In response to comments received, a series of further amendments are made.

- **February 2014** – Revised version of the Masterplan is approved as planning guidance by the City Council.

A Design Review of the Masterplan is undertaken by *Places Matter!*

- **July 2015** – The Preston Local Plan (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies) is adopted. Local Plan Policy MD2 outlines the specific criteria for development proposals in NW Preston. This lays the platform for the Masterplan to be adopted as an SPD to provide indicative supplementary guidance to Policy MD2.

A number of workshops are held with developers, landowners, URS (now AECOM), Lancashire County Council, and other stakeholders, with the aim of updating and improving the content of the Masterplan.

- **August 2015** – Working closely with LCC Highways, additional draft guidance entitled East-West Link Road Design Study, is produced by AECOM (formerly URS) providing further indicative detail for new development fronting along the East-West Link Road.
- **January 2016** – An updated Draft EWLR Design Guide is produced by AECOM.
- **February 2016** – An advisory document is produced by The Land Trust, entitled: Proposals for Strategic Green Space: Implementation and Management.
- **March 2016** – Further detail is produced by AECOM in relation to EWLR advance works at the main junctions/town and village centre/school location and crossing points, etc.

With the emergence of separate documents providing further layers of indicative supplementary detail, in the interests of being more user friendly, the Masterplan SPD is broken down into a suite of sub- documents. These are: an Overarching Statement (SPD sub-document 01); the main Masterplan document (sub document 02); Design guidance for development along the East West Link Road (by Aecom) (sub document 03), and Strategic green space guidance (by the Land Trust) (sub document 04).

- **June 2016** – LCC submit a planning application for the East West Link Road, on 22 June 2016.

- **July 2016** – The 2016 Draft NW Preston Masterplan SPD is published, and a four week period of public consultation is undertaken, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

As a result of the comments received to the 2016 public consultation (44 responses received in total), further meetings are held with some of the key stakeholders including LCC Highways and Education, and developers/landowners to discuss the main issues raised. Some minor amendments are made to the SPD as a result of the public consultation.

The delivery of the identified infrastructure – roads, community and greenspace - will be set out in a new supporting document: The NW Preston Delivery Plan (DP). This will supersede the Delivery and Implementation Plan (DIP) undertaken by consultants URS in 2014.

The draft guidance “Proposals for Strategic Green Space: Implementation and Management” (which was shown as forming part of the Masterplan suite of documents in the Draft SPD as Doc 04) will no longer be an SPD document, but will still provide useful background/information.

- **March 2017** – The revised NW Preston Masterplan SPD (as amended/updated) is put forward for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

## APPENDIX 2

### Key issues raised in the 2014 Masterplan consultation and how they were addressed

Issue raised	How issue was addressed in the SPD
Policy status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The adoption of the Preston Local Plan in July 2015 addressed many of the issues raised in the 2014 public consultation. The APLP paved the way for the Masterplan to be adopted as an SPD to supplement APLP Policy MD2: North West Preston.</li> </ul>
Development of roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clear street hierarchy and distinct character areas were specified in the Masterplan.</li> <li>The line of the EWLR was agreed through various workshops and close working with Lancashire County Council Highways and City Deal representatives. <i>[note: a planning application for the EWLR was submitted in June 2016].</i></li> <li>Additional indicative design guidance for the EWLR was produced by Aecom.</li> </ul>
Provision of infrastructure, including drainage/sewerage and schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>APLP Policy MD2 identifies a range of facilities.</li> <li>The Masterplan is a long term plan and is a fluid document.</li> <li>Issues relating to the provision and location of schools were the focus of ongoing discussions with Lancashire County Council Education and these are adequately catered for in the Masterplan, which allows for some flexibility in relation to the precise location of school building(s).</li> </ul>
Local centres and retail activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main town centre for NW Preston and the local centres are indicatively shown in the most accessible locations. However the indicative nature of the Masterplan allows for some flexibility.</li> <li>The designated district centre in the area is Cottam and the scale of retail development set out in APLP Policy MD2 and in the Masterplan respect this hierarchy.</li> </ul>
Green infrastructure, Provision of open space, and biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A document entitled Proposals for Strategic Green Open Space: Implementation and Management, was produced by the Land Trust.</li> <li>The Central Lancashire Biodiversity and Nature Conservation SPD was adopted in July 2015.</li> </ul>
Impact on existing residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is expected that the major road infrastructure will be in place before or alongside the scale of housing envisaged. The delivery of the EWLR in particular was the subject of ongoing discussions with Lancashire County Council Highways and City Deal representatives.</li> <li>Phasing and construction traffic issues will be assessed primarily at the planning application stage.</li> <li>Impacts of proposed developments on existing residents will also be assessed at planning application stage.</li> </ul>

Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stated vision for the development of NW Preston based on garden city principles is clarified in the 2016 draft SPD.</li> <li>• Further indicative guidance was produced for the 2016 draft SPD, including design characteristics along the route of the EWLR, the public realm, a street hierarchy, and defined character areas. The Council has worked closely with Lancashire County Council Highways and City Deal representatives, seeking to balance the traffic requirements of the EWLR with the place making aspirations of the SPD.</li> </ul>
Development under the Electricity lines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Placing high voltage cables underground is between 15 and 25 times more expensive than having overhead lines. Placing lines underground is therefore not a viable option.</li> <li>• National Grid discourage built development immediately below or adjacent to the power lines, and using the land for open space is considered the best option.</li> </ul>
Viability issues and phasing / implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers will be expected to contribute towards the infrastructure requirements for the area in the normal way (through the Community Infrastructure Levy, and Section 106 and Section 278 legal agreements, etc.).</li> <li>• The Phasing maps in the original Masterplan were removed from the 2016 SPD, as there is no policy basis for it in the 2015 APLP.</li> <li>• Infrastructure requirements will be discussed individually with developers at planning application stage.</li> <li>• Work ongoing to update the Delivery and Implementation Plan, with assistance from consultants Keppie Massie. It is intended that the DIP will address concerns raised about phasing, viability, implementation, and equalisation.</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 3

### Copy of the 2016 Draft Masterplan SPD Consultation letter



Date: 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016

Planning Policy  
Planning Department  
Preston City Council  
Town Hall  
Lancaster Road  
Preston  
PR1 2RI

Dear Sir / Madam,

#### **DRAFT NORTH WEST PRESTON MASTERPLAN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) - CONSULTATION**

Preston City Council has produced an updated revised version of the North West Preston Masterplan and is now seeking your comments, before it intends to formally adopt it as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to supplement Policy MD2 of the Preston Local Plan (adopted July 2015). **Representations are invited until 12th August 2016.**

The purpose of the NW Preston Masterplan SPD is to provide an indicative framework to guide new development in the area and to set out key design principles to encourage a sustainable and attractive new community. A previous version of the Masterplan was approved as planning guidance in February 2014. However further design guidance has now been added, including a finer grain of indicative detail for development along the East West Link Road corridor, the main local centre, and for strategic open spaces.

Once adopted, the NW Preston Masterplan SPD will act as a guide for developers when designing their proposals and will be a material consideration when assessing planning applications in the area. It comprises the following key suite of documents:

- 01: Overarching Statement;
- 02: NW Preston Masterplan (including indicative framework map);
- 03: East-West Link Road Design Guidance; and
- 04: Proposals for Strategic Green Space: Implementation and Management.

Supporting documents include:

- Consultation Statement; and
- Screening Report.

The draft SPD and supporting documents are available for download at:

[www.preston.gov.uk/masterplan](http://www.preston.gov.uk/masterplan)

Hard copies are also available at:

**Preston City Council**

Town Hall, Lancaster Road, Preston, PR1 2RL  
Opening hours Monday - Friday 9.00am - 5.00pm (except Thursday)  
Thursdays 10.00am - 5.00pm  
Tel: 01772 906900

**Ingol Library**

Ventnor Place, Off Tag Lane, Ingol, Preston, PR2 3YX  
Opening hours Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday & Friday 9.00am to 12.30pm, 1.30pm to 5pm, and Saturday  
9.00am to 12.30pm  
Tel: 01772 720483

Two public drop-in sessions will be held on the following dates:

- **Wednesday 20th July**, at Simons Lounge, Preston Grasshoppers, Lightfoot Green Lane, PR4 0AP (3pm to 7pm) and
- **Tuesday 26th July**, at Tanterton Village Centre, Kildgrove, Tanterton, PR2 7BX (3pm to 7pm)

Feedback from this consultation will be considered and will be reflected in the SPD at the end of the consultation period, taking into account the issues raised during the consultation. Further information will be communicated via the webpage [www.preston.gov.uk/masterplan](http://www.preston.gov.uk/masterplan)

Please submit your comments via the **online questionnaire**.

Alternatively comments can be returned by email to: [planningpolicy@preston.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@preston.gov.uk)  
or by post to: Planning Policy, Town Hall, Lancaster Road, Preston, PR1 2RL.

All representations must be received by **no later than 5pm on Friday 12<sup>th</sup> August 2016**.

Yours faithfully,

**Mike Molyneux**  
Planning Policy Manager

## APPENDIX 4

### Website questionnaire questions set out in the 2016 Draft Masterplan SPD Consultation:

- Q1. Contact details
- Q2. Do you agree with the principles of the masterplan?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No. If no please provide further detail. Also see questions below.
- Q3. Do you have any specific comments/suggestions relating to the suite of guidance documents (labelled SPD Docs 01-04)? If so – please see sub questions below, and please reference which sections or paragraphs your comments relate to (if applicable)
- Q4. Do you have any comments on **Document 01 – Overarching Statement?**
- Q5. Do you have any comments on **Document 02 – Updated Main Masterplan Document?**
- Q6. Do you have any comments on **Document 03 – East-West Link Road Guidance?**
- Q7. Do you have any comments on **Document 04 – Strategic Greenspace Proposals?**
- Q8. Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

## APPENDIX 5

Key issues/changes made to the Draft Masterplan SPD as a result of the 2016 public consultation.

Issue raised	How issue was addressed in the SPD
Principle/ Policy context / legal status of Masterplan as an SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The principle of development has been long established. APLP MD2 sets out the criteria for development in the area and the SPD provides additional indicative guidance to Policy MD2 and does not allocate land or confirm the exact scale/location of uses.</li> <li>The timing for adoption of the SPD is considered appropriate, particularly given the PWD/EWLR planning application currently under consideration. The indicative locations for the key infrastructure are based on optimum locations from an urban design perspective, but the SPD allows for flexibility.</li> <li>References in the Masterplan to Affordable housing and CfSH policies have been updated/amended to reflect current policy.</li> </ul>
Ownership of, and mechanisms for, the delivery and implementation of the key infrastructure including trigger points, phasing/timescales, conditions/CIL and S106, viability and deliverability, and equalisation mechanism for compensating landowners (Delivery and Implementation Plan, etc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The delivery of the identified infrastructure – roads, community and greenspace - will be set out in a new supporting document: The NW Preston Delivery Plan (DP). This will supersede the Delivery and Implementation Plan (DIP) undertaken by consultants URS in 2014. The DP will identify the type and cost of the infrastructure required along with the appropriate mechanisms (CIL, S106, S278) for their implementation.</li> <li>The Delivery Plan will also set out a method to address the issue of equalisation between those landowners/developers who are providing land for infrastructure and those that are not. The proposed mechanism will look to use the legislation in the CIL regulations so that those landowners/developers who provide land make a reduced CIL payment. It is intended that the Delivery Plan will be reviewed and updated regularly (annually) incorporating ongoing viability work being undertaken by consultants.</li> <li>Any reference to phasing has been removed from the SPD as there is no policy basis for it in the APLP. However, trigger points can still be applied for securing the appropriate timing of the delivery of the required funding/infrastructure through conditions and S106 / S278 legal agreements.</li> </ul>
Highways issues, transport and access including inconsistencies with LCC/EWLR application, highway capacity issues, (Tabley Lane in particular) and provision of cycling routes etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A planning application for the PWDR / EWLR (ref LCC/2016/0046) was submitted by LCC in June 2016. The Council has worked closely with Lancashire County Council Highways and City Deal representatives, seeking to balance the traffic requirements of the EWLR with the place making aspirations of the SPD. The Council is continuing to work closely with LCC to achieve compatibility between the SPD and the EWLR/PWD.</li> <li>LCC are carrying out further work on the detail of the PWD/EWLR planning application, including traffic modelling in respect of the capacity of Tabley Lane. Several traffic mitigation measures are proposed, including traffic calming measures on Tabley Lane to promote Sandy Lane as the main North/South route. Recent traffic modelling and forecasting (by LCC) has indicated that whilst the section of Tabley Lane to the South of the EWLR will in future experience increased peak period traffic volumes, this will not be to unacceptable/severe levels. The Masterplan also encourages the use of sustainable transport, including new bus routes and cycle and pedestrian routes, to be integrated into the existing network.</li> </ul>
Local centres including location, definition, hierarchy, and number of local centres, and impact on Cottam District Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst APLP Policy MD2 does not specify the number or location of local centres, the Masterplan is clear in its justification for assuming a main local centre and three smaller local centres which are identified indicatively in accessible locations to serve local needs. However the indicative nature of the Masterplan allows for flexibility. None of the proposed local centres would be of a scale that would affect the</li> </ul>

	<p>deliverability and viability of the proposed District Centre (Cottam Brickworks) and the retail hierarchy.</p>
<p>Green infrastructure/open space including parks/green buffers, land under the pylons</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasoned justification for the indicative location and amount of green infrastructure is set out in the Masterplan and supporting documents, including a site appraisal / consideration of existing constraints. An indicative green buffer abuts the M55 at the Northern edge of the Masterplan area. Two high voltage power lines (275kv and 400kv) cross part of the Western end of the area, and placing these high voltage cables underground is expensive and is not a viable option, so due regard has been given to National Grid guidance “A Sense of Place”, which discourages built development immediately below/adjacent to power lines.</li> <li>• Whilst acknowledging there will be varying amounts of green infrastructure on certain parcels of land than others, this is mainly a viability/equalisation issue (and is addressed separately). Guidance for the implementation and management of strategic green infrastructure is set out in supporting documentation by the Land Trust: “Proposals for Strategic Green Space: Implementation and Management”. Whilst this document was initially expected to form part of the suite of SPD documents (as Doc 04), this will no longer be an SPD document. However it will still provide useful background/information.</li> </ul>
<p>Foul and surface water drainage and SUDs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to achieve a unilateral drainage solution for the area, the delivery of new development will need to co-ordinate with the delivery of future infrastructure. The Masterplan stresses that early engagement from developers with their drainage strategies is essential. SuDS principles are applied across the site, and a clear surface water drainage hierarchy encourages all new development to manage surface water in the most sustainable, effective and appropriate way.</li> </ul>
<p>General design principles/guidance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Masterplan vision is based on the criteria of APLP MD2, and the Garden City principles of the Masterplan are clearly set out and justified. A key element of the Masterplan is the design of the road network through the area. Indicative guidance in the SPD includes design characteristics along the EWLR corridor, a specified street hierarchy, defined character areas, community infrastructure, and the public realm.</li> </ul>
<p>Heritage/archaeology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Masterplan area does not contain any designated heritage assets. However there are a number of non-designated assets. All designated and non-designated heritage assets lying within or in close proximity to the Masterplan area have been added to the Masterplan for clarity, as recommended by Historic England.</li> </ul>
<p>Residential amenity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main amenity concerns relate to increased traffic/congestion and the impact of construction traffic (highways issues are addressed separately). Any impacts on the residents of existing properties through loss of light/privacy etc will be assessed at planning application stage.</li> </ul>
<p>Other (more minor) issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the more minor issues include the size/colour and format of the SPD docs, various tweaks to maps and text, and ensuring consistency of wording and detail between documents. Appropriate amendments have been made to the SPD where necessary.</li> </ul>
<p>Site specific issues from landowners/developers:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site-specific issues include, amongst other things, reference to extant planning permissions and existing site features, and the provision and indicative location of the community infrastructure (such as schools, local centres, and green space, etc).</li> <li>• All issues raised in the consultation have been given due consideration. A number of follow-up meetings have also been held with some of the key developers/land owners, and with LCC Highways and Education, and minor amendments have been made where required/appropriate.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 6 to Consultation Statement:

### Schedule of Representations:

Summary of public consultation to the Draft (2016) Masterplan SPD: Summary of each response, and how the key issues were considered/addressed in the final (2017) Masterplan SPD. This has included input from Lancashire County Council (LCC).

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
1	Show Cottam [Parkway] railway station on the map?	<i>Site lies further South of the Masterplan area. Remains a proposal but not part of the Masterplan. Shown in City Deal plans– see weblink for up to date information: <a href="http://www.lancashirelep.co.uk/city-deal.aspx">http://www.lancashirelep.co.uk/city-deal.aspx</a></i>	No amendments proposed.
2 Full Life Church	Requirement for a place of worship and community centre.	<i>Comments noted/welcomed. Community Centres are proposed/ promoted within the Masterplan.</i>	No amendments proposed.
3	Traffic congestion and impact on existing residents prior to the EWLR in particular.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>APLP Policy MD2 allows development in advance of the EWLR provided it does not result in any severe impacts.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Masterplan proposals will have some impact in terms of increased traffic congestion and disruption to the existing highway network, but this will not be to severe/unacceptable levels.</i></li> <li>• <i>LCC traffic modelling (as part of the current PWD/EWLR planning application) has demonstrated that the impact on the highway network will not be severe, and that it will continue to work efficiently and safely to satisfactory levels.</i></li> <li>• <i>Construction traffic management will be delivered in collaboration with LCC as LHA. Impacts from construction traffic will only be temporary/short term, and will be</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjustments made to text in the transport section clarify the highway impact will not be to severe/unacceptable levels.</li> <li>• Transport and access section amended to reflect/clarify the current highways position, particularly in the context of the LCC PWD/EWLR planning application, and up to date traffic modelling.</li> <li>• Text amended to further emphasise that Tabley Lane is not promoted as the main North/South route from North of the EWLR (and reference made to traffic calming/change in priority at Tabley Lane/Sandy Lane junction).</li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
		<p><i>appropriately managed. The benefits of the EWLR will be long term.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Full details and delivery of the proposed East-West Link Road (EWLR) are outlined in the live planning application by Lancashire County Council (LCC) – as local highways authority (LHA): Application # and link: <b>LCC/2016/0046</b> <a href="http://planningregister.lancashire.gov.uk/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=6948">http://planningregister.lancashire.gov.uk/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=6948</a></i></li> </ul> <p><u><i>Tabley Lane</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>There will be increased traffic levels on Tabley Lane, but this will not be to unacceptable/severe levels.</i></li> <li>• <i>Up to date traffic modelling has been carried out to demonstrate this (as part of the LCC PWD/EWLR planning application).</i></li> <li>• <i>Tabley Lane is identified in the Masterplan for traffic calming north of the EWLR, including a priority change at the Tabley Lane/Sandy Lane junction.</i></li> <li>• <i>Sandy Lane is prioritized as the main North/South route to/from the masterplan area (North of the EWLR).</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The situation referred to in the consultation response #41) was a “do nothing” approach taken from the URS baseline evidence - this approach was not taken. Instead a commitment was made to constructing the EWLR.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Highways section of the Masterplan can be updated to clarify the Highways</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
		<p><i>position, with up to date traffic modelling/evidence from the LCC PWD/EWLR planning application.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Approved planning permissions (ie from before the Masterplan was approved as planning guidance) have restricted consideration of alternative options in terms of access to/from the masterplan area from South of the EWLR.</i></li> <li><i>Highway safety and capacity issues for all individual schemes will be assessed at planning application stage, in consultation with the local highways authority (LCC).</i></li> </ul>	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic and pollution on Tabley Lane at peak times which can't cope with the increased traffic volume. Made worse by the installation of traffic lights by Landorn kennels.</li> <li>Highway safety.</li> </ul>	See comments at <b>#3</b> above.	No amendments proposed.
5 Cllr Susan Whittam (PCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove Map 06 annotation – label 6 – “Eastway hub” site.</li> <li>Eastway Hub site should be residential only.</li> <li>Parish Council should have involvement in management of green spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Eastway Hub” site. Re planning application ref 06/2015/0283, the Appeal decision does not rule out any retail in this location - the reason for the dismissal of the appeal was the scale/retail hierarchy etc- not the principle of retail in this location.</i></li> <li><i>See comments at <b>#13</b> below. The local centre shown indicatively at Sandyforth Lane will not be coming forward as there is no requirement or demand and it</i></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
		<p>would not be commercially viable. The Masterplan will be updated in line with the residential planning application for that site (06/2014/0442) and the indicative location for a local centre at Eastway Hub will remain on the masterplan as an accessible and viable indicative location for a small scale local centre to appropriately meet local need without adversely affecting the retail hierarchy and the main district centre proposed at Cottam.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management of main greenspaces will be taken forward with the Land Trust (LT) work – supporting document. Local partners including the parish councils will be involved in taking forward the masterplan.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6</b> Cllr. Rowena Edmondton</p>	<p>Eastway Hub should be housing only (perhaps with small community facility).</p>	<p>See comments at #5) above.</p>	<p>No amendments proposed.</p>
<p><b>7</b> Cllr Damien Moore</p>	<p>Eastway Hub should not be retail (ie it should be residential).</p>	<p>See comments at #5) above.</p>	<p>No amendments proposed.</p>
<p><b>8</b> Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site specific comments only</li> <li>• Housing capacity/density, and alternative access arrangements north of Durton Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments noted and discussed in meeting. Alternative proposal put forward would adversely impact upon the Guild Wheel.</li> <li>• Average density of 30dph is what is indicated in the masterplan (SPD Doc 02). (NB-231 / 7.7ha = 30dph). Alternative access proposals to be discussed at follow-up meeting(s).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No amendments proposed at this stage.</li> <li>• To be kept under review and amended if necessary.</li> <li>• Meeting held.</li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
<p>9</p> <p>Woodplumpton Parish Council</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size/colour of docs.</li> <li>• Phasing/timescales/trigger points for delivery &amp; implementation of infrastructure.</li> <li>• Ownership for delivery of infrastructure – including role of the City Council, and transparency of funding and allocation of resources.</li> <li>• Traffic, incl. traffic into Woodplumpton, and Tabley Lane/Sandy Lane as priority route.</li> <li>• Budget &amp; maintenance of the green space (incl. small greenspace / highway verges etc).</li> <li>• More clarity re purpose of the SPD, which is the overarching document; and clarity of wording re references to main local centres and local centres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All comments noted, and discussed in detail at follow up meeting.</i></li> <li>• <i>Phasing has been removed from the Masterplan guidance documents as there is no phasing policy in the APLP. Delivery &amp; Implementation – a Delivery Plan will be updated &amp; published separately as a supporting document.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Delivery Plan under preparation:</b></p> <p><i>The key infrastructure required is set out in APLP Policy MD2 (requiring developers to provide or financially support the provision of roads, schools, and green infrastructure, etc.).</i></p> <p><i>The Masterplan key infrastructure will be implemented through a range of options- including: through CIL; planning conditions; and Section 106 and 278 agreements. The previous draft of the Masterplan was underpinned by a raft of baseline information, which included a draft Delivery and Implementation Plan (2014). This has been subject to review.</i></p> <p><i>The delivery of the identified infrastructure – roads, community and greenspace - will be set out in the Delivery Plan, which will identify the type and cost of the infrastructure required along with the appropriate mechanisms (CIL, S106, S278) for their implementation.</i></p> <p><i>The Delivery Plan will also set out a method to address the issue of equalisation between those landowners/developers who are providing land for</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor alterations made to masterplan text, including clarifying all references to local centres.</li> <li>• Updated Delivery Plan to be published as a separate supporting document and updated regularly. (Delivery Plan under preparation).</li> <li>• Land Trust document clarified in the SPD as a separate supporting document (and will not form part of the suite of SPD documents).</li> <li>• Meeting held.</li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
		<p><i>infrastructure and those that are not. The proposed mechanism will look to use the legislation in the CIL regulations so that those landowners/developers who provide land make a reduced CIL payment. It is intended that the Delivery Plan will be reviewed and updated regularly (annually) incorporating ongoing viability work being undertaken by consultants.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Highways land would be managed/maintained by the Highways Authority (LCC) and land outside of that would be the subject of a management plan as part of individual planning proposals.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Land Trust work does not lay out specific guidance. It is work in progress – which is included for useful information. To clarify the status of this information, this will be a separate supporting document only, and will not form part of the suite of SPD documents.</i></li> <li>• <i>Local partners including the Parish Councils will be involved in taking forward the masterplan.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>10</b> Company - Afordable Homes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detailed strategy document required.</li> <li>• Policy to be clearer on affordable housing – including encouragement to use smaller house builders.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Affordable housing policy is set out in the Adopted Core Strategy &amp; Preston Local Plan. Also an Adopted Affordable Housing SPD. The guidance is however subject to update/review.</i></p>	<p>All references to affordable housing amended/updated to reflect current policy position.</p>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
11 Woodland Trust	Woodland should be native tree species, preferably trees grown from seed in the locality, and should have a soft edge/merging into adjoining areas rather than a hard edge	<i>The Land Trust work does not lay out specific guidance. It is work in progress – which is included for useful information. As the Land Trust (LT) work is developed further – this will be discussed and shared with local partners – including the Woodland Trust and local parish/town councils.</i>	All of the Land Trust work (supporting document) to be updated and refined in line with ongoing work.
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic congestion</li> <li>• Should be a roundabout instead of the existing Wychnor traffic lights.</li> <li>• More green space needed as a buffer to the M55.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>See comments at #3).</i></li> <li>• <i>The Wychnor traffic lights are existing lights and there is no suggestion in the masterplan to remove/alter these. Traffic modelling carried out by LCC show the lights work satisfactorily, but this can be revised in the future if necessary.</i></li> <li>• <i>The green space buffer is indicative only and the extent of the buffer can be updated and refined as necessary in line with ongoing work.</i></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.
13 David Wilson Homes North West	Remove any reference/annotation of a local centre at Eastern end of the EWLR where there is no requirement or demand and it would not be commercially viable.	<i>The Masterplan will be updated in line with the residential planning application for this site (06/2014/0442). For reference - see related comments at #5).</i>	<i>The Masterplan will be updated in line with the residential planning application for this site (06/2014/0442).</i>
14	Remove any reference/annotation of a local centre at Eastern end of the EWLR.	<i>See comments at #13) above</i>	See comments at #13) above.
15 Indigo Planning on behalf of CEG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanism for the delivery of the key infrastructure.</li> <li>• Equalisation to share out the infrastructure costs &amp; to compensate for loss of developable land. More open space is being provided than necessary. Impact on viability and deliverability of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>See comments at #9).</i> <i>The main issues of viability / delivery / equalization raised will be addressed in an updated Delivery Plan. This will be a “live” document – which will be reviewed regularly (at least annually).</i></li> <li>• <i>Timing of adoption of SPD under review.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery Plan to be updated and published as a separate supporting document (see comments at #9).</li> <li>• Reference to Code for Sustainable Homes removed.</li> <li>• Main masterplan Map 06 (SPD Doc 02) updated to take account of site features</li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
	<p>housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD should not be adopted until the LCC EWLR application is determined.</li> <li>• Linearity of power lines should be broken up not emphasised (as per National Grid <i>Sense of Place</i> guidance).</li> <li>• Site specific: Does not align with field and ownership boundaries.</li> <li>• Object to location of primary school – should move further west.</li> <li>• It needs to be made clear that flexibility will be applied when assessing proposals and that the masterplan framework map is very clearly referenced as being indicative only.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Masterplan proposals accord with the National Grid “Sense of Place” guidance. Flexibility can be applied when assessing proposals close to the power lines, and the extent of the green space is not rigid/fixed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Minor tweaks to the framework map can be made to align with field/ownership boundaries.</i></li> <li>• <i>Location of the school further west is not acceptable as too close to the power lines, endorsed by LCC Education who carried out a comprehensive feasibility study for the location suggested by the developer – this confirmed that the alternative location is <b>not</b> suitable.</i></li> <li>• <i>Amendments to all text can reflect in clearer terms that flexibility can be applied when assessing proposals and that the masterplan framework map is indicative only.</i></li> <li>• <i>Previous meetings held with developer.</i></li> </ul>	<p>(slight amendments to main street routes).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site specific issues – discrepancies addressed re existing land features/ownership boundaries etc - noting that the masterplan is <u>indicative</u> only.</li> <li>• Adjustments to supporting text clarify the indicative nature of the masterplan and that there will be flexibility.</li> <li>• Meeting held with developer.</li> </ul>
<p><b>16</b> Historic England</p>	<p>Heritage and archaeological detail (including non-designated structures) should be included in the Masterplan and in the screening report, including Cromwell’s mound</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Comments noted and welcomed.</i></li> <li>• <i>The background information has been reviewed and detailed information for heritage assets within/close to the Masterplan area will be included in the SPD.</i></li> <li>• <i>Meeting held.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Masterplan updated to include heritage assets.</li> <li>• Main Map (SPD Doc 02) updated to include designated heritage assets – with further detailed information attached as a comprehensive appendix.</li> <li>• Meeting held.</li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
<p><b>17</b></p> <p>Nathaniel Lichfield &amp; Partners on behalf of Taylor Wimpey and Bloor Homes</p>	<p>Summary of <b>main concerns</b> as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the delivery of the community infrastructure and other requirements will impact upon the viability and deliverability of developments; and that this has not been properly examined or tested.</li> <li>2. There remains a lack of clarity on the requirements for and the funding of the community infrastructure (including the secondary school) that the Local Plan and SPD between them seek to ensure are delivered. The evidence base that underpins those requirements is out of date and has not been updated to have regard to more recent assessments, requirements and other information (including on viability).</li> <li>3. That the SPD imposes additional obligations and requirements over and above those found in the Local Plan (exemplified that they are not requirements that have been imposed on recent approvals). SPDs cannot allocate land – masterplan should be progressed as a DPD as an Area Action Plan.</li> <li>4. There is a lack of any detail on a method or approach to equalisation of infrastructure and S106 requirements (including both payments in kind and reductions in affordable housing provision) with the SPD.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All comments noted. Meeting held with developer to clarify main concerns.</i></li> <li>• <i>See comments at #9).</i> <i>The main issues of viability / delivery / equalization / funding will be addressed in an updated Delivery Plan. This will be a “live” document – which will be reviewed regularly (at least annually).</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Masterplan does not impose additional requirements over and above those in Policy MD2 of the APLP. The SPD provides further guidance / indicative detail which will assist in delivering the aspirations of APLP Policy MD2.</i></li> <li>• <i>Any inconsistencies with extant outline permission can be addressed.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>PCC are working closely with LCC to address any inconsistencies between the EWLR application and the masterplan.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Other issues raised</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Much of the evidence base in the masterplan sets out the baseline and is relevant in so far as it sets out the context of how the masterplan was developed and the evidence used. Updated work will be referred to in the updated document, such as recent highway infrastructure traffic modelling etc from the LCC PWD/EWLR planning application.</i></li> <li>• <i>The additional SPD documents have been integrated by using an overarching statement to reference sub documents.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery Plan to be updated and published as a separate document – to be updated regularly (see comments at #9).</li> <li>• Masterplan updated in line with other more minor comments where relevant/necessary.</li> <li>• Hierarchy of SPD docs clarified. Land Trust work will now be a supporting document.</li> <li>• Overarching Statement re-named as SPD User Guide/Overarching Statement, for clarity of purpose.</li> <li>• Meeting held with developer.</li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
	<p>5. That the SPD fails to have regard to the requirements of my clients committed development, including the provision of open space, density, character and layout considerations (as defined upon the parameters plan and other information conditions as part of the outline planning permission).</p> <p>6. That the application for the East West Link Road [EWLR] pays no cognisance of the requirements of the SPD and is thus contrary to the requirements of the Local Plan and SPD.</p> <p><u>Other issues raised:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence base out of date</li> <li>• The additional SPD docs have not been properly integrated, the status of the docs is unclear, and whether something is expected standard or encouraged.</li> <li>• Remove reference to CFSH</li> <li>• Drainage _ unclear what consideration has been given to the practicality of [SuDS] and a global drainage solution.</li> <li>• Masterplan Design Principles _ do not follow through in the entirety of the document.</li> </ul> <p><u>Site specific concerns:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments made re the design of the EWLR and main local centre.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Clarity of what is desirable or a requirement is set out as clear as possible. This can be reviewed in future. However, the SPD is additional guidance/indicative detail only and this is made clear in the SPD docs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The hierarchy of the SPD docs can be made clearer. In particular, the Land Trust work will become a supporting document.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Overarching Statement could also be re-named as a User Guide, for further clarity.</i></li> <li>• <i>Reference to the CFsH will be removed/updated as necessary.</i></li> <li>• <i>The text re drainage can be updated to make it clearer about infrastructure/capacity and a holistic coordinated approach. UU has provided a full response in this respect – see comments at #19).</i></li> <li>• <i>Design principles are applied throughout the document, including a clear vision and street hierarchy.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Site specific concerns</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Discussed in meeting with developers. Other amendments to be carried out where relevant/possible.</i></li> <li>• <i>Agree re the indicative location of secondary school moving further north in urban design terms, but ONLY if this is achievable in the context of existing site constraints – in particular</i></li> </ul>	

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest relocating the secondary school to the north (better in urban design terms);</li> <li>• Extant permissions should be taken into consideration and accurately referenced.</li> </ul>	<p><i>the proximity of the school and the school playing fields to the overhead power lines (refer to similar comments re schools and power lines at #15)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Extant permissions will be taken into consideration.</i></li> </ul> <p>Meeting held with developer.</p>	
<p><b>18</b> Cushman &amp; Wakefield, on behalf of Royal Mail</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites will need to be identified for Royal Mail facilities in the area.</li> <li>• Traffic/highways issues and postal service delivery implications due to congestion in particular before the highways infrastructure is place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If/when potential sites come forward, any such applications will be determined through the planning application process, including formal pre-application advice.</i></li> <li>• <i>See previous comments at #3)</i></li> </ul>	<p>No amendments proposed.</p>
<p><b>19</b> CBRE on behalf of United Utilities Water</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UU request early engagement from developers providing details of their drainage strategy to ensure drainage infrastructure is delivered in a holistic and coordinated manner as part of an overall strategy.</li> <li>• Surface water/hierarchy. The hierarchy should be updated in the masterplan, and it should be a clear requirement of the Masterplan SPD that all new development should manage surface water in the most sustainable, effective and appropriate way.</li> <li>• Foul drainage - The need for, and form of, any wider strategic drainage solution will be informed by consideration of the cumulative impact of all drainage proposals.</li> <li>• Reference made to existing UU assets, water abstraction boreholes and source</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Refer to related Env Agency comments at #22)</i></li> <li>• <i>Additional supporting text and links/contact details for UU and the LLFA and the EA can be added.</i></li> <li>• <i>Reference to a global drainage solution can be clarified.</i></li> <li>• <i>Reference can be made to UU assets and SPZs, although the only Source Protection Zone (SPZ1) in the Masterplan area covers part of the M55 buffer and some of the Preston Grasshoppers site.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Amendments to text to reflect all UU comments and suggestions, including reference to a clear drainage hierarchy, and reference to development being required to be delivered in a comprehensive and co-ordinated manner.</p>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
	protection zones (SPZs).		
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process is not democratic &amp; local residents not listened to</li> <li>Loss of countryside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The correct procedures have been followed and every effort has been made to engage with the public and listen to their concerns.</i></li> <li><i>The principle of development for NW Preston has already been established by Policy 1 of the Core Strategy and Adopted Local Plan Policy MD2.</i></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local residents ignored</li> <li>Principle of development in this location</li> <li>Infrastructure needs to go in before more houses are built. House prices affected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>See comments at #20) above.</i></li> <li><i>The delivery of the required community infrastructure (timings/costings/viability issues etc.) will be covered in the updated Delivery Plan.</i></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.
22 Env. Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to clarify the role of the EA, which has changed. Reference needs to be made to the LLFA.</li> <li>The SPD area lies on a Major Aquifer and there is a Source Protection Zone. The type of development proposed poses low risk to these groundwater sources, but appropriate SUDs should be put in place.</li> <li>Suggest some minor amendments / additions to the text including making a reference to a recent EA publication (weblink included).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Amendments can be made as suggested, in conjunction with UU comments at #19).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text updated to clarify role of EA and references to the LLFA and recent EA case studies also added.</li> </ul>
23	High-quality cycling infrastructure required, with separate cycle lanes from the highway where possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Sustainable travel is promoted in the Masterplan, including the provision of new cycle routes &amp; shared pedestrian</i></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
	<p>(refer to related comments by the Preston Cycle Liaison Group, at #42)</p>	<p><i>and cycle links/green links.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Guild Wheel will not be adversely affected by the masterplan, and the aim is to have permeability through the area for cyclists and pedestrians, and connectivity to adjoining/ surrounding areas.</i></li> <li>• <i>The LCC PWD/EWLR planning application will have cycle provision on both sides of the EWLR.</i></li> </ul> <p><u><i>Suggested alternative cycle route</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>An alternative cycle route was suggested by the Preston Cycle Liaison Group (via Russell Rees, PCC - see comments at #42).</i></li> <li>• <i>The suggestion was for the cycle provision to avoid the PWD/EWLR roundabout at the Western end of the EWLR and an underpass at the Eastern end of the EWLR (instead of a Pegasus crossing).</i></li> <li>• <i>Whilst desirable, the suggested alternative cannot be justified given land ownership issues and substantial funding/timing constraints. The suggestion is welcomed, but is not a practical/viable solution. All road crossings will be made as safe as possible. Note: This issue mainly relates to the LCC PDW/EWLR planning application.</i></li> <li>• <i>It would be desirable to avoid new masterplan estate roads crossing the green space/cycle/pedestrian routes, but this is not practical given the strategic aim of the Masterplan is to free up development</i></li> </ul>	

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
		<p><i>potential of the masterplan area. All crossings will be made as safe as possible.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meeting held with LCC Highways and Russell Rees (PCC).</i></li> </ul>	
24	Residential amenity – possible loss of privacy for existing resident(s)	<p><i>Any residential amenity impacts on residents of individual properties will be addressed during the planning application process. The masterplan seeks to achieve a sustainable community for the benefit of all the residents of North West Preston.</i></p>	No amendments proposed.
25	Concern that Landorn kennels will be re-located.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Masterplan does not show Landorn kennels as being re-located.</i></li> <li>• <i>Planning permission has been granted for the re-organisation of the site, suggesting the owners of the kennels are likely to stay.</i></li> <li>• <i>This is a commercial matter and the respondent needs to discuss this with Taylor Wimpey.</i></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.
26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Tabley Lane cannot cope with future traffic volumes – will be severe traffic congestion at peak times.</i></li> <li>• <i>Nothing to deter traffic from using Tabley Lane when travelling from Tanterton to Woodplumpton.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>See comments/actions at #3).</i></p>	No amendments proposed.
27 Turley Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Deliverability – how will the community infrastructure and green space be provided</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The rationale for locating infrastructure has been set out in the SPD and its parent policies (Core Strategy Policy 1 and APLP Policy MD2).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Land ownership maps amended</i></li> <li>• <i>References to affordable housing and CFSH amended.</i></li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
on behalf of Redrow Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No detailed viability assessment</li> <li>• Mechanism needed for the fair and equitable sharing of infrastructure costs across the area (Equalisation)</li> <li>• Clarify land acquisition costs for the schools and open spaces / gifting of land?</li> <li>• The Delivery and Implementation Plan from 2014 said equalization would be addressed (Keppie Massie work)</li> <li>• Land ownership/land options maps have been over-simplified</li> <li>• Rationale for locating some of the proposed community uses in particular areas is unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The main issues of viability / delivery / equalization raised will be addressed in an updated Delivery Plan.</i></li> <li>• <i>This will be a “live” document – which will be reviewed regularly (annually).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery Plan to be updated and published as a separate document – to be updated regularly (see comments at #9).</li> </ul>
28 Hollins Strategic Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the Local Centre designation at Eastway Hub</li> <li>• Must make it abundantly clear that the SPD does not confirm the exact scale and location of uses. Make reference to the wording in the Local Plan Inspectors report.</li> <li>• Must not specify the amount of local centres;</li> <li>• Be accurate on planning history and land ownerships;</li> <li>• Accurately plot existing Local Centres and acknowledge a Local Centre will not be at Sandyforth Lane/Lightfoot Lane;</li> <li>• Confirm that the proposed green buffer may not always be necessary, dependent upon the proposed use;</li> <li>• Proposed shared green links must take</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meeting held with developer.</i></li> <li>• <i>The potential alternative local centre annotation at Eastway Hub should remain in the masterplan, given the site identified in the masterplan at Sandyforth Lane will not be coming forward (refer to related comments at #5)</i></li> <li>• <i>It should be clear throughout the document that the SPD is only additional guidance / indicative detail to support adopted policy, and the masterplan itself does not allocate sites etc.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Make reference to the wording in the Local Plan Inspectors report (paras 25 and 49)?</i></li> <li>• <i>Clarify that the SPD does not confirm the exact number, scale and location of uses (as above).</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendments to maps and text to clarify indicative nature of the masterplan.</li> <li>• Reference to the “small scale mixed use local centre (400m radius catchment area)” removed.</li> <li>• Meeting held.</li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
	<p>account of extant permissions; and Bus routes.</p> <p>Doc 03: EWLR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure consistency with all wording of local centres.</li> <li>• Remove any reference to the “mini supermarket (GFA = 800 – 1800m2)”.</li> </ul>	<p><i>The comments are noted and the text/maps can be amended to accommodate suggested amendments where necessary.</i></p>	
29 Natural England	No comments	<i>Noted</i>	No amendments required
30	Support the masterplan and the relocation of the secondary school to the north	<p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>However, refer to related comments at #17).</i></p>	No amendments required
31 De Pol on behalf of Cottam Hall Properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest amendments to text to clarify the meaning, scale and hierarchy of the local centres</li> <li>• Remove any reference to the additional small scale local centre – including any reference to floorspace.</li> <li>• This may adversely affect the viability/deliverability of the Cottam District centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Amendments to text can be made as suggested.</i></li> <li>• <i>All local centre locations are indicative only, and the masterplan makes it clear that none should be of a scale that would affect the hierarchy/viability of Cottam District Centre.</i></li> <li>• <i>Local centres in the NW Preston area should be of an appropriate scale and be sited in accessible locations to appropriately serve local need.</i></li> <li>• <i>Refer to related comments at #5) and #13) re local centre annotations.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meaning, scale and hierarchy of the local centres and the retail hierarchy clarified more clearly.</li> </ul>
32 De Pol on behalf of local land owner	Footpaths on Ingol golf course incorrectly identified as Public rights of way.	<p><i>Noted. However this site lies outside the masterplan area and the map referred to was a background document (Original area appraisal).</i></p>	Minor amendment to map key (Map 05 – original area appraisal) SPD Doc 02, pg.13.

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
<b>33</b> De Pol on behalf of local land owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPD does not make it clear that the line of the EWLR is indicative and not fixed.</li> <li>Separate representations will be made to LCC re the EWLR application regarding access issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Masterplan map is indicative.</i></li> <li><i>The route and specifications of the EWLR will be determined by the LCC planning application currently under consideration.</i></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed
<b>34</b> Barratt Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vision statement is vague and not supported by Policy MD2.</li> <li>There is no reference to Garden City principles in Policy MD2, so this phrase needs to be justified or taken out.</li> <li>Area Appraisal (Section 3) is informed by the Baseline Report which is several years old and should be updated.</li> <li>Map 06 and Map 10 need to reflect extant planning permissions eg the Eastway site, outline consent 06/2013/0195 and Reserved Matters 06/2016/0504. Map 06 shows a local park / play area in the centre of the site, which should be removed.</li> <li>Section 4.1 – Residential &amp; Employment Provision: This is vague and is not clear what the potential indicative mix is based on. Is it the latest SHMA, and does that disaggregate need to NW Preston</li> <li>4.1: Code for Sustainable Homes – now abandoned.</li> <li>Remove/replace the image of Welwyn Garden City</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Vision statement is supported by adopted policy. Garden City principles are referred to in Para 52 of the NPPF, which states: “The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities”.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Garden cities are also referred to in the preamble to Local Plan Policy MD2. Paragraph 4.17 states: “The masterplan advocates Garden City design principles..”. The Local Plan was found sound at examination and was adopted in 2015.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The area appraisal/baseline report is a background document which informed the evidence base</i></li> <li><i>Site specific issues/concerns can be discussed at planning application stage</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor amendments to Main masterplan Map (SPD Doc 02) to reflect extant permissions etc.</li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
<p><b>35</b> Paul Walton Associates on behalf of Fulwood Amateurs AFC</p>	<p>Fulwood Amateurs should not be shown as part of a “wider Preston Grasshoppers” site and it should be identified for housing.</p>	<p><i>Noted. This error will be corrected.</i></p>	<p><b>Doc 02 Map 06 - Note 5</b> Land owned by Fulwood Amateurs removed as being part of the “wider Preston Grasshoppers site”</p>
<p><b>36</b> P Wilson &amp; Company on behalf of local land owner</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viability (site specific and for the area as a whole),</li> <li>• Equalization,</li> <li>• Delivery mechanisms,</li> <li>• Amount and location of key infrastructure (including green space).</li> <li>• Timing and delivery of, and who pays for, the infrastructure (including green space).</li> <li>• Location of the open space/parks inappropriate and should be spread across a wider area – it also emphasizes the power lines.</li> <li>• Lack of certainty to plans (indicative)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The main issues of viability / delivery / equalization raised will be addressed in an updated Delivery Plan. (refer to comments at #9). This will be a “live” document – which will be reviewed regularly (annually).</i></li> <li>• <i>Re: certainty: Any planning applications within the NW Preston area will be determined in line with adopted policy. The key policy covering NW Preston is Policy MD2 of the Preston Local Plan (this is repeated in full in the SPD documents: Doc 01 Overarching Statement (pg5) and in Doc 02-Main masterplan (pg8). Policy MD2 outlines all the key infrastructure requirements. The masterplan only supplements this.</i></li> <li>• <i>The power lines are a restraint to development and National Grid have clarified that the power lines will remain in situ. Built development under, close to, or restricting access to the power lines is not encouraged.</i></li> <li>• <i>National Grid has produced guidance “A Sense of Place” for the best ways of utilising this space. Open space/parkland is a preferred option.</i></li> <li>• <i>See related comments from national Grid at #44).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery Plan to be updated and published as a separate document – to be updated regularly (see comments at #9).</li> </ul> <p>This will address issues of viability, equalization, delivery mechanisms/certainty for provision of key infrastructure, amount and location of the green open space etc.</p>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
<b>37</b> P Wilson & Company on behalf of NW Preston Delivery Group	Viability and equalization needs to be addressed properly and adoption of the SPD should be delayed until it has been addressed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments / actions at <b>#36)</b> above.</li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.
<b>38</b> P Wilson & Company on behalf of local land owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the location of the green infrastructure on their land.</li> <li>• SPD should say that the provision of green infrastructure will not apply in that location if the overhead power lines are removed/diverted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments / actions at <b>#36).</b></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.
<b>39</b> P Wilson & Company on behalf of local land owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendments required to some of the maps.</li> <li>• Object to the location of the green infrastructure on their land.</li> <li>• SPD should say that the provision of green infrastructure will not apply in that location if the overhead power lines are removed/diverted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments / actions at <b>#36).</b></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.
<b>40</b> P Wilson & Company on behalf of local land owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the location of the green infrastructure on their land.</li> <li>• SPD should say that the provision of green infrastructure will not apply in that location if the overhead power lines are removed/diverted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments / actions at <b>#36).</b></li> </ul>	No amendments proposed.

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverse impact on health and amenity of residents due to traffic, particularly on Tabley Lane, which is not fit for purpose as a main road into NW Preston from the Tanterton Hall roundabout.</li> <li>• Tabley Lane would become the main north-south route, not Sandy Lane. Tabley Lane would see a 300% increase in traffic at peak times.</li> <li>• Lack of robust evidence (incl health/amenity impact assessments) for using Tabley Lane.</li> <li>• Lack of any mitigation on Tabley Lane.</li> <li>• Suggest an alternative solution (eg restricting or closing Tabley Lane, south of the EWLR, to vehicular traffic).</li> <li>• Images and tables included within the response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>See comments / actions at #3).</i></li> <li>• <i>Meeting held with LCC Highways to discuss Tabley Lane and other highway related issues</i></li> <li>• <i>Full FOIA response already issued to respondent under Freedom of Information legislation.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No amendments proposed</li> <li>• Meeting held with LCC Highways</li> <li>• Refer to comments/actions at #3)</li> </ul>
42 Preston Cycle Liaison Group (via Russell Rees, PCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest an alternative cycle route/diversion (map provided) to avoid conflict with cyclists and motor vehicles at the Western end of the EWLR_ at the proposed PWD/EWLR roundabout. The alternative route suggested would start just south of the EWLR, cross the EWLR (an underpass?) and then run along the Western edge of the PWD, to the north of the EWLR.</li> <li>• An underpass is preferred to a Pegasus crossing at the Eastern end of the EWLR (at the Sandyforth Lane/EWLR junction).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>See comments / actions at #23) above.</i></li> <li>• <i>Meeting held with LCC Highways and Russell Rees (PCC).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No amendments proposed.</li> <li>• Meeting held.</li> </ul>

#	Summary of comments received / key issues	PCC response	Amendments / actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estate roads should not cross the green space corridor (under the pylons). If they <i>have</i> to cross, table crossing points should be installed (with priority over motor vehicles).</li> </ul>		
<b>43</b>  (Russell Rees – PCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Car club</li> <li>Electric vehicles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>These issues promote sustainable development and are welcomed. However they apply to all development proposals and not just those in NW Preston.</i></li> <li><i>However, some reference could be made to travel plans / car clubs / electric car charging points etc. in the Masterplan supporting text.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Text added making reference to car clubs/electric vehicle charging points etc.</b></li> </ul>
<b>44</b>  National Grid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are high voltage apparatus in the masterplan area. Whilst National Grid does not own the land, it has rights of access, and it is National Grid policy to retain these existing overhead lines in-situ.</li> <li>Advise developers and planning authorities to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments. Buildings should not be built beneath the power lines</li> <li>Has produced guidance to encourage high quality and well planned development in the vicinity of its high voltage overhead lines “A Sense of Place”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Comments noted, particularly that National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath or in close proximity to its overhead lines.</i></li> <li><i>A link to the National Grid guidance re how to create high quality development near overhead lines “A Sense of Place” can be included in the Masterplan.</i></li> <li><i>Additional text can be added to the masterplan to stress the need to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments</i></li> <li>‘A Sense of Place’: <a href="http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Senseofplace/Download/">http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Senseofplace/Download/</a></li> <li>Further information regarding development near overhead lines and substations: <a href="http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl_final/pdf/brochure.htm">http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl_final/pdf/brochure.htm</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text added making reference to the National Grid guidance “A Sense of Place” and contact details and web link etc provided (included in the drainage and utilities section).</li> </ul>