



Examination of The Partial Review of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032
Fylde Council response to the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions
(MIQs)

February 2021

Matter 1 Compliance with statutory procedures and legal matters

Issue 1a – Has the Council met the statutory duty to cooperate as set out under Sections 20(5)c and 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Q1. Has the Council engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of the Partial Review, in the context of relevant strategic matters, including meeting any unmet needs from neighbouring authorities? Does the evidence clearly demonstrate the nature of any cooperation activities and the outcomes that have been achieved?

- 1.1.1 The Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with prescribed bodies in the preparation of the Partial Review in relation to strategic matters, and this has been endorsed by our neighbouring authority Wyre Council in its representation.
- 1.1.2 The evidence of the co-operation that has taken place and the outcomes achieved are provided in the Statements of Common Ground: SDPR05(a) between Fylde Council and the other Fylde Coast authorities Blackpool Council and Wyre Council; SDPR05(b) between Fylde Council and West Lancashire Borough Council and SDPR05(c) between Fylde Council and the Central Lancashire authorities South Ribble Borough Council, Preston City Council and Chorley Council. Section 8 of each of the statements of common ground provides a record of the engagement in the preparation of the Partial Review with the respective authorities.
- 1.1.3 The scoping (Regulation 18) consultation was sent to all prescribed bodies, and the responses are set out in SDPR07, the Statement of Regulation 18 Consultation (Regulation 22 (1) (c) (i - iv) document. In the case of Highways England, clarification was provided verbally following concerns that the purpose of the Partial Review had not been understood. In advance of publication, all prescribed bodies were provided with and asked for any comments on the draft Partial Review document, and the draft Statement of Common Ground.
- 1.1.4 Regular meetings of Council officers have taken place under the Memorandum of Understanding with the Fylde Coast Authorities. This has ensured that each Council has been able to explain and clarify their intentions in progressing their respective plans. This has continued during the Covid-19 pandemic using virtual meetings in Teams. Discussion during

the meetings has then been followed by liaison between relevant officers in Wyre, Blackpool and Fylde Councils, to ensure that the statement of common ground reflected an understood position from all parties. The initial outcome was the Draft Statement of Common Ground in the form provided to the members of Fylde Council's Planning Committee in March 2020 for approval for publication.

- 1.1.5 At Publication stage, all prescribed bodies were sent the consultation and responses are set out within the submission documents SDPR08(a) and (b), SDPR09 and SDPR10.
- 1.1.6 The Statements of Common Ground were again circulated to neighbouring authorities following from the publication consultation prior to submission. At this stage further liaison took place between officers of the respective councils in order to achieve signed statements for submission. The Council extended the Statement of Common Ground with Preston and South Ribble to include Chorley Council, in order that all Central Lancashire authorities were included and reflecting the decision of those authorities to plan jointly.
- 1.1.7 The measures taken by the Council to ensure effective engagement notwithstanding the Covid-19 pandemic demonstrate a thorough but proportionate approach which is considered to fully comply with the Duty to Cooperate in the manner set out in Sections 20(5)c and 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the PPG.

Q2. In relation to Wyre Borough Council's unmet housing needs, a revised approach is set out for paragraphs 1.24-1.27 in the Partial Review. My queries are:

a. How has the duty to cooperate been specifically met in this regard?

- 1.2a.1 The Statement of Common Ground SDPR05(a) between Fylde Council, Blackpool Council and Wyre Council sets out the principal evidence of the cooperation that has taken place. A statement of the engagement that has occurred is provided in section 8 of the Statement of Common Ground. It does not set out a detailed record of every meeting or communication between the authorities. This is in accordance with the advice in PPG. However, for the purpose of clarity, some further detail is provided in this response.
- 1.2a.2 The Statement of Common Ground SDPR05(a) also sets out the outcomes of the engagement in terms of an agreed understanding of the respective positions of the authorities relating to the strategic matters. Section 5 of the Statement of Common Ground sets out the programme of each authority for plan production. For information, to update the position since submission, Blackpool Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Publication Version was approved for publication and submission at Blackpool Council's meeting of 10th February 2021, and was published for Regulation 19 consultation on 19th February 2021 with the consultation running to 2nd April 2021. Section 6 sets out the respective positions regarding housing need, including the position in respect of unmet need and the need to review or update. Section 7 indicates the housing requirements for each borough.
- 1.2a.3 Fylde Council's intention to commence the Partial Review was indicated at the Fylde Coast Duty to Cooperate Officers' Group meeting of 12th March 2019 (minutes attached in Appendix 1), shortly after the adoption by Wyre Council of the Wyre Local Plan (2011-2031) (the WLP) on 28th February 2019.

- 1.2a.4 Fylde Council undertook the Regulation 18 consultation between 25th April 2019 and 6th June 2019. It was sent to Wyre and Blackpool Councils as part of the consultation with all consultees on the Council's Planning Policy database. Wyre Council responded stating that they had no comments at that stage. Blackpool Council did not respond to the Regulation 18 consultation.
- 1.2a.5 At meetings in July (Appendix 2) and November 2019 (Appendix 3) further discussion took place concerning the preparation of Fylde's Partial Review and the timing of the neighbouring councils' plans. It was suggested that authority plan timescales could be aligned in the future, but after the current reviews had taken place. Early discussion took place on the form and content of statements of common ground.
- 1.2a.6 Draft Partial Review documents including an initial draft of the Statement of Common Ground were produced for approval by Planning Committee in January 2020 for sustainability appraisal; these were then shared with Wyre Council and Blackpool Council, as well as other prescribed bodies under the Duty to Cooperate. Wyre Council and Blackpool Council (and others) were invited to provide comments on the proposed Partial Review documents, in particular the Draft Statement of Common Ground.
- 1.2a.7 The meeting in February 2020 (Appendix 4) gave the opportunity for the Partial Review draft and the Draft Statement of Common Ground to be discussed. In particular, Wyre Council was keen that it should emphasise the existence of unmet need now. Concern was raised over specific paragraphs in the Statement of Common Ground. It was agreed that Wyre Council would confirm the specific matters at issue in an email and that officers from the two authorities would work to resolve the issues following on from the meeting.
- 1.2a.8 There followed a period of liaison between the officers of the authorities to produce a text of the Draft Statement of Common Ground agreeable to all parties. Liaison took place by means of emails and telephone calls between officers that resulted in a version of the Draft Statement of Common Ground which was agreed text, but retained two areas of disagreement. This form of the Draft Statement of Common Ground, together with the other Partial Review documents, were presented to the Council's Planning Committee on 11th March 2020 for approval for Publication.
- 1.2a.9 Prior to the Planning Committee meeting, a letter was received by Fylde Council from Wyre Council. The letter is provided as Appendix 2 of SDPR10. In it, Wyre Council proposed:
- that the matters to be addressed by Policy LPR1 would most comprehensively be dealt with jointly;
 - working together to identify where the unmet need should be accommodated, alignment of plan processes to accommodate this;
 - that housing need should be jointly considered: Wyre Council were seeking quotations from Turley and Lichfields, and that this could be a cross-boundary assessment if Fylde Council wished;
 - any review of the transport and highways infrastructure matters affecting Wyre could be dealt with jointly; and
 - alignment of plan making timescales with the potential to more effectively deal with the matter of unmet housing need should be considered.
- 1.2a.10 The letter was provided to the Planning Committee meeting on 11th March 2020 as a late observation. An additional resolution was made at the meeting *"That officers be asked to continue to liaise with Wyre Council in order to seek to address the issue of unmet housing*

need in Wyre.”. No resolutions were put forward by members proposing that the Council should take up Wyre Council’s proposals for joint evidence.

1.2a.11 Fylde Council replied to the letter from Wyre Council on 24th March 2020 (Appendix 3 of SDPR10). The reply stated that Fylde Council did not wish to commit at that stage to the joint commissioning of supporting documents in relation to housing need and highways and transport capacity, but wished to keep the matter under review.

1.2a.12 The reasons that Fylde Council adopted this position can be summarised as follows:

- Fylde Council’s assessment of need had already been undertaken in the Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper, and was based on the standard method in accordance with national policy. Fylde Council saw no reason to review the existing assessment that had already been completed, and to which Wyre Council did not appear to have had regard;
- Fylde Council did not consider that an assessment of need should require consultants to be engaged, in view of the aims of the national policy in bringing forward the standard method to simplify the process (also considered in paragraphs 2.3 to 2.8 of EDPR04);
- Fylde Council did not consider that jointly-sponsored highways evidence would be appropriate, as the entire focus would likely be on highways - and for that matter sustainable transport - issues within Wyre, significant elements of which would be distant from the boundary with Fylde; and
- As far as alignment of plan-making was concerned, Wyre Council had suffered some slippage due to staff changes, but if it had chosen to adopt the same approach to housing need as Fylde Council from the beginning of its review process, there is no reason why the plans could not have been aligned already. By seeking to engage consultants regarding housing need, further delay was inevitable. Fylde Council was keen to proceed, rather than suffer further delays waiting for its neighbouring authority, who would have determined the pace of progress henceforth. The pause in plan making that has been taken by Wyre Council clearly justifies this approach.

1.2a.13 Fylde Council had intended that the Partial Review would be published for Regulation 19 consultation between March and May 2020, immediately following approval by Planning Committee but owing to the Covid-19 lockdown this could not take place. The Partial Review and all supporting documents including the Draft Statement of Common Ground were published for Regulation 19 consultation on 23rd July 2020. A representation was received from Wyre Council (pages 21-22 of SDPR08(a)) which reiterates some of the points raised and refers back to the earlier letter of 6th March. The letter endorsed the cooperation that took place, noting: *“Wyre Council have been able to respond on a number of matters through Duty to Cooperate (DtC), in addition to emails exchanges and phone conversations between members of your team and my own. This cooperation has been positive, ongoing and constructive and has resulted in some changes to the documents concerned; particularly the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).”*

1.2a.14 Following on from the consultation, in advance of submission of the Partial Review, the Draft Statement of Common Ground was circulated to Blackpool and Wyre Council. At the outset, this was for the purpose of signature, however the authorities agreed to seek to resolve remaining issues of disagreement. Further direct liaison between officers of Fylde Council and Wyre Council, and to a lesser extent Blackpool Council, by email and telephone, to make some

limited revisions to the Draft Statement of Common Ground, resulted in the final version to which the three authorities are signatories.

- 1.2a.15 Engagement between the authorities continues, with a further Fylde Coast Duty to Cooperate officers' meeting due to be held on 9th March 2021. A verbal update will be provided in the hearing session on any matters that arise from this meeting that are relevant to the Examination of the Partial Review, if the Inspector so requests.
- 1.2a.16 The outcome of the process is that the respective councils have established ways forward for their local plan reviews which have regard to the position of the neighbouring authority. The position of Wyre Council as set out in its letter of representation is recognised by Fylde Council. The Partial Review offers a backstop position which meets the commitment to address unmet need in accordance with FLP32 paragraph 1.27.

b. Does the evidence demonstrate that Wyre Borough Council will be able to deliver unmet housing needs in its own area, or is there still a potential that unmet needs may need to be provided elsewhere?

- 1.2b.1 The unmet housing need of 380 dwellings in Wyre for the plan period of the Wyre Local Plan (2011-2031) is a residual amount following the adoption of the Wyre Local Plan. The plan was adopted following the addition as a main modification of Policy LPR1 Wyre Local Plan Review.
- 1.2b.2 The Inspector's report to the WLP¹ sets out his view that planning for a shortfall against need, on the basis of the highways infrastructure constraint, was not justified. In paragraphs 28 and 29 he explains: "*I consider that the highway constraints are overstated ... those towns which are best able to capitalise on sustainable transport modes and minimise the need to travel and where there is developable land, such as Poulton-le-Fylde and Garstang, do not maximise opportunities to meet identified needs*". Later in paragraphs 72 to 74 the Inspector sets out his views more fully, and in paragraphs 76 to 78 he sets out solutions, including modifications to add further housing sites and the requirement for a review with the objective of meeting the OAN within the plan period. The alternative, as he sets out in paragraph 75, would have been to suspend the Examination, to allow the evidence to be reviewed. The plan was able to be found sound only by adding a significant number of additional sites identified by the Council (it is understood these were principally sites given planning permission in the meantime) and a windfall allowance, and then in addition to that, to a partial review to consider the evidence further.
- 1.2b.3 These conclusions reflected on a question the Inspector asked of Wyre Council in the Examination Hearing, where Wyre Council was asked whether any assessment in relation to paragraph 14 of the 2012 Framework had been undertaken. It was incumbent on Wyre Council to demonstrate, if they were not to meet objectively assessed needs (with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change) that *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted*. This test remains, slightly modified but substantively unchanged, in the 2019 Framework. In response, Wyre Council made reference to the Highways study undertaken by

¹ https://www.wyre.gov.uk/downloads/file/5574/final_report_on_the_examination_of_the_wyre_local_plan

Lancashire County Council, but did not provide further justification. The Inspector opens this section of the report in paragraph 68 with reference to this test.

- 1.2b.4 The Inspector of the WLP would not have required the addition of the main modification in the form of Policy LPR1 unless he considered it justified and effective in dealing with the residual amount of need that could not be addressed by straightforward modifications to the plan being examined.
- 1.2b.5 The text of WLP main modification Policy LPR1 is unambiguous in stating the objective of Wyre Council meeting its own needs. In case the point needed further emphasising, the Inspector states in paragraph 19 of his report: *“I have amended the wording of the MMs to reflect the objective of Wyre meeting its own housing OAN”*.
- 1.2b.6 In relation to the elements of the WLP Policy LPR1 required by the WLP Inspector, Fylde Council recognises and understands that, firstly, in the matter of housing need, the level of housing need that will be identified by the review that Wyre Council will undertake cannot yet be known. This point has been made by Wyre Council in its representation to this Partial Review. However, it remains the case that an assessment of need made under the standard method as set out in the paragraph 3.16 and Table 3 of the Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper EDPR04 would be significantly lower (308 dpa) than the existing requirement (460 dpa) and the previously-assessed OAN figure (479 dpa) and therefore would eliminate any unmet need assessed in the preparation of the WLP. The Inspector will have recognised the implication of including the reassessment of need as part of Policy LPR1, in the light of the lower standard method figure². Secondly, in the matter of the need for a review of the highways evidence including the possibility for the inclusion of sustainably-located sites with reduced impacts on critical elements of the highways network, it is understood that this requires a substantial piece of new evidence but it would be preferential to Wyre Council if its production were not needed. Thirdly, in the matter of allocation of sites, any decision would be for Wyre Council but the clear implication of the Inspector’s report is that his view is that further allocations could be possible if required. However, as noted in Wyre Council’s representation to the Partial Review, *“it cannot be assumed that Wyre Council, through the partial review process, will be able to meet its housing needs in full within the Borough. The Inspector’s Report into Wyre’s Local Plan made it clear that further consideration needed to be given as to the extent to which any unmet need could be met in Wyre through a review of transport and highway issues. This is reflected in LRP1 (2). Until detailed consideration has been given to this issue through the review process, it has not been established that Wyre can meet any unmet needs within the Borough”*. Neither, by the same token, has it been established that it cannot.
- 1.2b.7 Therefore, as Wyre Council is clear that the level of need is as yet unknown, it follows directly Fylde Council cannot be in a position to know, either what the need will be or whether any of it cannot be met. Although work commenced on Wyre Council’s review of its local plan, following the release of the White Paper and the consultation on the revised draft standard

² The representation by Fylde Council to the WLP Publication consultation quoted the standard method figure for Wyre (313 dpa) that had been included within the all-authority list https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644783/Housing_Need_Consultation_Data_Table.xlsx in the government consultation on what was at that stage the draft proposal. The standard method was brought into use in July 2018; the Inspector’s report is dated 1st February 2019.

method, work on the review was “paused” by Wyre Council³ pending further guidance from the government. The Council will, with the Inspector’s permission, provide a verbal update to the Examination hearing on the current position of Wyre Council’s paused review following the Duty to Cooperate meeting scheduled for 9th March 2021.

1.2b.8 The commitment made by Fylde Council in the Partial Review addresses unmet need in accordance with the statement made in paragraph 1.27 of the FLP32. The answers provided by the Council to questions 2 c, d and e below explain further.

c. The proposed revised wording for paragraph 1.26 states that ‘Any housing need that cannot be met in Wyre...is provided for if needed through the new housing requirement range...in the Partial Review...’. This is based on standard method calculations of assessing housing need which will be discussed under Matter 2, in response to questions posed there. Can the Council please clarify whether the Partial Review proposes to meet Wyre’s identified unmet needs?

1.2c.1 The commitment made in the proposed paragraph 1.26 is an integral part of the Partial Review as submitted. It is a commitment that the Council has chosen to make, as part of a Partial Review with a housing requirement of 275-415 that follows from an assessment of minimum local housing need of 275 dwellings per annum. The commitment is qualified, that is, it applies in the event that unmet need is demonstrated at the end of Wyre Council’s review process.

1.2c.2 Paragraph 11b of the Framework requires that:

a. strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas,

1.2c.3 The outcome of the Wyre Local Plan Examination is that, whilst there is unmet need, the requirement for the review in WLP Policy LPR1 indicates that it is not demonstrated that housing needs “cannot be met” in Wyre. Needs that “cannot be met” will only be demonstrated at the conclusion of the review process of the WLP set out in WLP Policy LPR1.

1.2c.4 The Partial Review does not, therefore, provide for the unmet need immediately. The effect of paragraphs 1.26 is to provide for unmet need where it is established through Wyre Council’s Partial Review. This is a “backstop” position. It recognises that Wyre Council, through its own adopted Local Plan policy, is required to review its Local Plan with the objective of meeting its own needs. This is clearly preferential in sustainability terms, unless Wyre Council is able to demonstrate through its review that any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Where, through its Partial Review following the process set out in Policy

³ Fylde Council was notified of this position at the meeting on 9th September 2020 of the Lancashire Development Plans Officers’ Group, a forum used by officers in Lancashire to discuss the planning policy issues of the day. The minutes state: “The Local Plan Partial Review has reached Reg. 18 stage, with a consultation document and subsequent responses published. The review remains in place but is paused pending further guidance from the government on the proposed new approach to local planning, including a revised NPPF, the consequences of which may require a full review to be undertaken.”

LPR1, Wyre Council establishes that unmet need still remains, Fylde Council can provide for this to be met through its housing requirement of 275-415.

- 1.2c.5 The commitment to assist is therefore provided as an adjunct to Wyre Council's own plan review. Between the two, there is provision for any reasonably foreseeable residual unmet need to be met.

d. Should the Partial Review include a revised commitment to help meet any unmet housing needs, where relevant?

1.2d.1 Were the Partial Review modified to commit the Council to meet the existing unmet need identified by the WLP, without any need for review of the WLP, this would result in a fundamentally less sustainable solution than that proposed by the Inspector of the WLP. It would render the WLP Policy LPR1 superfluous, even though this policy was deliberately inserted through modification to make the WLP sound. If the Inspector of the WLP had decided that the WLP was sound without seeking to plan to meet needs in full, he would not have required the insertion of the policy through the main modification.

1.2d.2 The existing commitment in the Partial Review ensures that unmet need within the housing market area is addressed, in line with the commitment made in paragraph 1.27 of the FLP32.

1.2d.3 The Council does not consider that there is a need to revise the commitment made in the Partial Review. Any revision that committed the Council to meeting existing unmet needs immediately, would disapply WLP Policy LPR1 and would undermine and contravene the findings of the Inspector who examined the WLP.

e. Overall, in this regard, is the approach in the Partial Review soundly based?

1.2e.1 The approach of the Partial Review is soundly based. It supports the conclusion of the Inspector who examined the Wyre Local Plan, that Wyre Council should review its Local Plan with the objective of meeting its needs in full, i.e. without assistance from neighbouring authorities. It provides a "backstop" position, which is a second-best solution to Wyre Council being able to meet its own needs, but which ensures that any residual need is met. Any alternative approach would be fundamentally less sustainable. The approach is positively prepared, because it will deliver unmet need if it is required. It is justified because it accords with the findings of the Inspector of the WLP. It is effective because it achieves the desired outcome of delivering housing to meet needs, whatever the outcome of Wyre Council's Partial Review will be. It is in accordance with national policy, planning for needs that cannot be met, through the Statement of Common Ground, in addition to identified housing needs using the prescribed standard method.

1.2e.2 The Partial Review will meet the commitment made in Paragraph 1.27 of the FLP32 to examine the issue of unmet need following the adoption of the WLP with unmet need. The Partial Review provides for a staged approach to the unmet need which ensures that it will be addressed in accordance with FLP32 Paragraph 1.27. In summary, the stages are:

- The Partial Review will be adopted with the "backstop" commitment by Fylde Council;
- In accordance with WLP Policy LPR1, Wyre Council will make an updated assessment of need as part of its review;

- If any need remains unmet, Wyre Council will conduct the remainder of its review in accordance with WLP Policy LPR1, including a reassessment of transport and highways evidence with the aim of meeting needs in Wyre, taking into account potential for sustainably located sites;
- Having regard to the above, as part of its review, Wyre Council will in accordance with Policy LPR1 allocate sites to meet need unless justified to not do so under paragraph 11 of the Framework;
- If the review of the WLP is adopted with unmet need, the Partial Review of the FLP32 will meet it through its revised housing requirement of 275-415 dpa.

The Partial Review therefore addresses the issue of unmet need appropriately and in line with national policy and with the outcomes from the adopted WLP, providing still for the future outcomes of Wyre's review process.

Issue 1b – Has the Partial Review been prepared in accordance with other legal and procedural requirements?

Q3. Is the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Report [SDPR02] suitably comprehensive in assessing the environmental, social and economic effects of the of the Partial Review, in accordance with legal and national policy requirements?

1.3.1 Yes.

1.3.2 It is a legal requirement for development plans, including the FLP32 and its Partial Review, to be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The work on this was carried out for the Council by Arcadis. Whilst the FLP32 and the associated SA was found to be sound, it has been necessary to update the SA to reflect the revisions made as a result of the Partial Review. The updated SA/SEA is tightly focussed on these revisions. Additionally, as more than five years had elapsed since the last time the scope of the SA was updated, there is a statutory requirement to consult on its scope. The statutory consultees for this (Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency) were involved in a five-week consultation that commenced on 17 January and ended on 21 February 2020 in accordance with the Government's published SA and SEA guidance and SEA Regulations.

1.3.3 The SA has considered the environmental, social and economic effects of the Partial Review of the FLP32 through the SA Framework and the scope of the appraisal was agreed with the statutory bodies. The content of the SA Reports produced meets the requirements of the SEA Regulations for inclusions in an Environmental Report. Each of these requirements in terms of content and procedure is clearly signposted in the reports. The responses received are presented and analysed within the SA Scoping Report.

1.3.4 As a requirement of the SEA Directive, a fundamental part of the SA is to identify and assess any reasonable alternatives. This assessment was carried out in the SA of the adopted FLP32 and likely significant effects of any reasonable alternatives were determined. The adopted FLP32 was subsequently found sound.

- 1.3.5 Some representations have presented objections to the SA's assessment that there are "no reasonable alternatives" to the Partial Review of the FLP32. The scope of the Partial Review is very narrow, and each of the proposed revisions to policies are considered to be necessary for the FLP32 to be legally sound in light of the latest version of the NPPF, whilst also being necessary to ensure that the Council works effectively with neighbouring authorities. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF19 also states that "Plans may also need to be revised to reflect policy changes which this replacement Framework has made. This should be progressed as quickly as possible, either through a partial revision or by preparing a new plan". The Council, therefore, considered that any alternative approach to this, such as to not review the FLP32 and revise policies, or to revise the policies in a different way such that they may not be legally sound or contribute towards effective co-operation with neighbouring authorities, would not be a reasonable approach. As such, there are no 'reasonable alternatives' to the proposed revisions to policies and so no reasonable alternatives have been appraised in SA Report. Some representors put forward the opinion that increased level of housing provision should have been assessed as a 'reasonable alternative'. An increase in housing provision could have been an alternative. However, it would not be reasonable to assume that in light of the already adopted 415 figure in the FLP32 and given the changes between the two Frameworks that an increase above 415 would be a 'reasonable alternative'. This is discussed in greater detail in the SA report (SDPR02).
- 1.3.6 There were two main conclusions arising from the SA. Firstly, the report asserted that there were no reasonable alternatives to that put forward by the Council. Secondly, was that overall, only minor amendments and updates to the existing appraisals of policies were required and, generally speaking, where effects were updated they were made more positive. No new negative effects on the environment or sustainability are predicted as a result of the sustainability appraisal of the Partial Review.

Q4. Does the Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report [SDPR03] meet the legal requirements for assessing whether the Partial Review, either in isolation and/or in combination with other plans, is likely to have a significant adverse effect on relevant European sites, in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)?

- 1.4.1 Yes.
- 1.4.2 The Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032: HRA Report, published by Arcadis in July 2018, considered the potential implications of the FLP32 for European Sites within and near to the Borough boundary. It concluded that, following the comprehensive and robust Appropriate Assessment, the FLP32 would result in no likely significant effects on the integrity of the European sites identified within the HRA Report, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 1.4.3 This work on the updated HRA report for the Partial Review was again carried out by Arcadis and was undertaken in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (recognised section 'Conservation Objectives' para 2.1.2.3 of the report). This HRA Report is tightly focussed on the revisions being made to the FLP32. It does not consider elements of the FLP32 that are not being changed a result of the Partial Review.

- 1.4.4 Each of the proposed revisions within the Partial Review was assessed to determine whether it would have any impact on European sites. If it was considered that the proposed revision could have a negative impact on a European site, either alone or in combination, then this proposed revision would be taken forward to the detailed screening stage. As a result of the proposed revisions relating to changes in housing number, two policies required more detailed consideration, as presented in Section 2.3 of the HRA report. These policies are:
- Policy DLF1: Development Locations for Fylde; and
 - Policy H1: Housing Delivery and the Allocation of Housing Land.
- 1.4.5 Paragraph 2.3.3.4 of the HRA report concludes that Policy DLF1 and Policy H1 would not undermine the conservation status of a European site as they would not result in an increased overall level of development that could impact on these sites. As such, the Council's proposed revisions to DLF1 and H1 can be objectively ruled out at this stage.
- 1.4.6 For policies and site allocations that have not been revised the existing assessments and results in the July 2018 HRA Report remain valid and accurate.
- 1.4.7 The Council recognise that the HRA is an iterative process and have worked with the relevant parties throughout. No issues were raised by the relevant stakeholders through the consultation process. Although the HRA is focussed on the changes proposed by the Partial Review, there have been no material changes, such as new Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) designations, that would impact on or undermine the conclusions of the FLP32 SA. Additionally, the lead statutory consultee Natural England confirmed that they had no objection to the Schedule of Revisions and that they concur with the conclusions of the Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report.

Q5. Has the Partial Review been prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and statutory consultation requirements?

- 1.5.1 Yes.
- 1.5.2 Initially, the Council carried out a three-week pre-consultation with statutory consultees. They were sent the Draft Statement of Common Ground, the Schedule of Revisions and the Summary of Responses to the Regulation 18 Consultation on 30th January 2020. The Statutory Consultees were asked to respond saying whether they wish to be an 'additional signatory' to the Draft Statement of Common Ground.
- 1.5.3 A Public Consultation (Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England)Regulations 2012 No 767 Part 6) on the scope of the Partial Review of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (PRFLP32) was carried out for six weeks from 25 April - 6th June 2019.
- 1.5.4 The Council also carried out a Public Consultation on the Publication Version of the PRFLP32 (Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012: Regulation 19/20) for six weeks from 23 July 2020 - 3 September 2020.
- 1.5.5 Both consultations were carried out in line with statutory consultation requirements. They were carried out for a minimum of 6 weeks with all statutory bodies being consulted in both cases. These consultation methods and periods align with those laid out in Regulation 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the subsequent

Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

- 1.5.6 The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) demonstrates Fylde Council's commitment to engage with local people and other stakeholders on planning issues. It sets out how the Council are going to consult on the other documents that will make up the Development Plan, including the Partial Review of the FLP32.
- 1.5.7 An updated SCI was approved by Planning Committee in March 2020. As a result of the ongoing pandemic, revisions were made to the SCI in June 2020, in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (updated on 13 May 2020) which states that where any of the policies in the SCI cannot be complied with due to the current guidance to combat the spread of Covid19, the Local Planning Authority is encouraged to make an immediate review to update the policies where necessary so that plan making can continue.
- 1.5.8 The main change to the SCI was an amendment to the text that said as part of the consultation process the Council will be "making the consultation document available on the council's website, hard copies available at the Council offices, public libraries and other appropriate deposit points". In those places the text was amended to say: "making the consultation document available in accordance with the relevant regulations". This meant that the Council was able to carry out a consultation in line with any amended Regulations introduced in the period of uncertainty caused by COVID19.
- 1.5.9 Documents SDPR07 Statement of Regulation 18 Consultation (Regulation 22(1)(c)(i-iv) Statement) and SDPR10 Statement of Regulation 20 Consultation (Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) Statement) outline the Council's consultation materials and methods and further confirm that the consultations have been carried out in accordance with the Council's SCI and statutory consultation regulations
- 1.5.10 In regards to the consultation process itself, the Scoping Consultation for the Partial Review of the FLP32 was conducted by means of a letter sent to all consultees registered on the Council's Planning Policy Register of Consultees, and published on the website. In addition, a press notice was issued, which appeared in the Lytham St Annes Express newspaper. The consultation letter was made available on the Council's website, at the Council's offices for public inspection, and at libraries throughout the Borough. The Scoping consultation took place over 6 weeks, between Thursday 25th April 2019 and Thursday 6th June 2019.
- 1.5.11 The consultation on the Publication Version of Partial Review of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 was undertaken from 23 July 2020 until 5.00pm on 3 September 2020. Again, letters or emails were sent to everyone on the Planning Policy consultation database, a list of more than 1100 organisations and individuals. A formal public notice was placed in The Lytham St. Annes Express and the documents were made available on the Council's website. However, the COVID-19 situation made certain types of consultation impossible. The documents were made available in paper form by appointment at the Town Hall, and arrangements were offered to make documents available to people shielding. This is discussed further in Question 9.
- 1.5.12 The Council has complied fully with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and statutory consultation requirements.

Q6. Has the Partial Review been prepared in accordance with the Council’s Local Development Scheme?

1.6.1 Yes. The Council’s up-to-date Local Development Scheme (LDS) was adopted in October 2020. Whilst the 2019 LDS had set out an initial timescale for the Partial Review, progress was delayed as a result of the ongoing COVID19 pandemic. The updated 2020 LDS describes the Partial Review process and set out the updated timescale for its completion. The Council have followed this timetable to date and expects to continue to follow the process laid out in the LDS 2020.

Q7. In accordance with paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the Council proposes, in Appendix 1 of SDPR03, to distinguish whether policies are strategic or non-strategic. The vast majority of policies are proposed to be strategic. Are the reasons for determining the status of the policies as strategic or non-strategic clear? Are the strategic policies limited to the strategic priorities for the area and any relevant cross-boundary issues, as required by the Framework?

1.7.1 Whilst there is no precise definition available for either, the NPPF19 provides policy on what constitutes strategic (paragraphs 20-23) and non-strategic policies (paragraphs 28-30). However, there is little presented within the Framework to clearly distinguish between the two.

1.7.2 The PPG (Paragraph: 076 Reference ID: 41-076-20140306) provides some guidance and advises that when reaching a view on whether a policy is a strategic policy the following are useful considerations:

- whether the policy sets out an overarching direction or objective
- whether the policy seeks to shape the broad characteristics of development
- the scale at which the policy is intended to operate
- whether the policy sets a framework for decisions on how competing priorities should be balanced
- whether the policy sets a standard or other requirement that is essential to achieving the wider vision and aspirations in the local plan or spatial development strategy
- in the case of site allocations, whether bringing the site forward is central to achieving the vision and aspirations of the local plan or spatial development strategy
- whether the local plan or spatial development strategy identifies the policy as being strategic

1.7.3 It is now a statutory requirement for each local planning authority to identify the strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the authority’s area. The policies to address those priorities must be set out in the local planning authority’s development plan documents (taken as a whole) (Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017). This post-dates the preparation of the adopted FLP32, where distinguishing between strategic and non-strategic policies was not required. Therefore, they are not differentiated within the adopted FLP32. For this reason, the Council has had to revisit the FLP32 policies and interpret and apply the current national policy and guidance retrospectively.

1.7.4 The Council interprets this guidance to mean that strategic policies are those that address the ‘big picture’ rather than dealing with more detailed matters. They may cover things like the

spatial pattern of development, protection of valued assets of district wide significance and issues that affect the whole district. Conversely, non-strategic policies are interpreted as the policies that are more detailed and more localised.

- 1.7.5 The Council recognise that a clear strategic planning context is essential and is often driven by influences that extend beyond Council boundaries. Additionally, the Council recognises that a significant number of the policies in Appendix 1 have been termed 'strategic'. The wider geography of Fylde and its location on the Fylde Coast means that there are a greater number of cross-boundary issues, and therefore, a greater number of strategic policies. The Council has taken part in effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities through regular Duty to Cooperate meetings with neighbouring authorities throughout the production of the adopted FLP32 and through the Partial Review process.
- 1.7.6 The strategic matters were set out in the Statement of Compliance – Duty to Cooperate during the production of the FLP32, which was subsequently found sound. They are:
- Housing delivery: to meet identified needs in the context of the wider sub-regional housing market and to establish a more balanced and wider choice in the housing market area;
 - Employment land delivery: to meet identified employment land need in the context of the Fylde Coast sub-regional market area to strengthen, promote and enhance the economy;
 - Commuting patterns: Fylde forms part of the Fylde Coast Travel to Work Area, which shows that there is a close correlation between work and housing in the sub-region.
 - Provision for Gypsies and Travellers: to meet the identified needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the wider sub-regional context.
 - Retail provision and Fylde Coast sub-regional hierarchy of centres: to establish the role of town centres within the Fylde Coast and their position in the retail hierarchy and future retail growth; and to recognise the role and importance of Preston City Centre (in the neighbouring subregion of Central Lancashire) in providing for the retail needs of residents of Fylde. Fylde has three town centres; two District Centres and five local centres.
 - Transport: Regional connectivity is important to Fylde due to both the advanced engineering and manufacturing economy and tourism. Therefore, there is a need to manage the impact of new development on the strategic and local transport network.
 - Water-related infrastructure is a key cross boundary issue which directly affects the delivery of built development across the Fylde Coast and Central Lancashire. The main issues relate to surface water drainage; the capacity of the existing wastewater treatment network and the need to ensure that proposals for new development have no adverse effect on bathing water quality along the Fylde Coast, including the Ribble Estuary, the Wyre Estuary and the Irish Sea.
 - Health, security, community and cultural infrastructure: new development as proposed in the Fylde Local Plan will have implications for a range of health, education, community and cultural providers.
 - Natural Environment – managing impacts on habitats and/or landscape character designations.
- 1.7.7 The scope of the Partial Review of the FLP32 is narrow, with two objectives. The relevant objective here is to revise the adopted FLP32 to reflect policy changes that the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 has made. With no relevant revisions proposed that will result in amendment to this part of FLP32, the strategic cross-boundary issues remain

unchanged and therefore sound. This is reflected in the choice of the policies with the prefix 'strategic' in Appendix 1 of SDPR01.

- 1.7.8 Ultimately, whether a policy is strategic or non-strategic is a matter of judgement for the Local Planning Authority having regard to the Framework and the PPG. The Council has had regard to that policy and guidance when determining which policies are strategic and non-strategic.

Q8. Regulation 8(5) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 requires any new plan to list the policies in existing adopted plans which it is intended to supersede. The introductory text to the Schedule of Revisions to the Fylde Local Plan [SDPR01] states that the Partial Review supersedes nine specific policies in the adopted Fylde Local Plan to 2032. Is Appendix 1 of the adopted Local Plan proposed to be updated to show that these nine policies are to be superseded by the Partial Review? Can the Council clarify please?

1.8.1 Yes.

1.8.2 The Council will prepare an additional section to Appendix 1 of the FLP32 which lists the nine policies that have been superseded by the Partial Review.

Q9. Does the Partial Review accord with the public sector equality duty, as specified under the Equality Act 2010? How has the Partial Review sought to ensure that due regard is had to the three aims expressed in s149 of the Equality Act 2010, in relation to those who have a relevant protected characteristic?

1.9.1 Whilst the Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) the Council recognises that the Partial Review of the FLP32 must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED).

1.9.2 The PSED is a duty on public authorities to consider how their policies and decisions affect people who are protected and therefore have protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010. Under the Equality Act, there are 9 protected characteristics:

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- marriage and civil partnership
- pregnancy and maternity
- race
- religion or belief
- sex
- sexual orientation

1.9.3 The PSED has three main aims and requires public bodies to have due regard for the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different people.

1.9.4 A catalyst for carrying out the Partial Review of the FLP32 was to respond to changes in national policy since the adoption of the FLP32. Those changes in national policy have been

subject to an EqIA undertaken by Government. The EqIA was carried out on the Framework in 2018⁴ to assess the impact of policy changes to make sure that actual or potential barriers had been identified and removed and that opportunities to promote equality were maximised. The scope of the EqIA follows the scope of the Equality Duty. The Council has had regard to the EqIA prepared by the Government throughout the Partial Review process.

- 1.9.5 The consultations on the Partial Review of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 were undertaken for 6 week periods between 25th April 2019 and 6th June 2019 and 23 July 2020 and 3 September 2020. Letters or emails were sent to everyone on the Planning Policy consultation database, a list of more than 1100 organisations and individuals. The specific groups are presented in document SDPR07: Statement of Regulation 18 Consultation (Regulation 22(1)(c)(i-iv) document.
- 1.9.6 These included groups with what are considered to have protected characteristics including:
 - Disabled
 - Ethnic Racial and National Groups
 - Religious Groups and Churches
 - Gypsy & Travellers Wyre/Fylde Forum
- 1.9.7 A formal public notice was placed in The Lytham St. Annes Express. The documents were made available on the Council's website.
- 1.9.8 To guarantee that due regard was given to the three aims, whilst keeping the ongoing COVID19 pandemic in mind, the Council ensured that every person would have ample opportunity to engage in the consultation process. The documents were made available for inspection at Fylde Council's Town Hall, in a meeting room close to the main entrance. It was acknowledged that although the Council were unable to undertake face-to-face appointments, to guarantee the safety of both Planning Officers and customers, a phone number would be provided so that a Planning Officer could be contacted directly to answer any questions.
- 1.9.9 The Council also recognised that vulnerable customers may be shielding and be unable to visit the Town Hall in order to view the documents. To account for this, an additional note was also added to the Regulation 19 Consultation letter to ensure that provision would be made for every person who was shielding as a result of COVID19 to view the documents and they would therefore have the same opportunity to view a hard copy of the consultation documents, should they require.
- 1.9.10 The measures implemented by the Council were conducted in accordance with all COVID guidelines whilst ensuring that every customer had equal opportunity to view documents irrespective of their individual circumstances.
- 1.9.11 The Council has complied with the PSED in the production of the Partial Review of the FLP32.

4

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/728404/National_Planning_Policy_Framework_-_Equality_Impact_Assessment.pdf

Q10. Has the Partial Review been prepared in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 in all other respects?

1.10.1 Yes, the Plan has been prepared in accordance with and complies with the relevant Acts and regulations (as amended).

1.10.2 Further details are given in the following documents:

- SDPR05(a-c) – Statement of Common Ground – Duty to Cooperate
- SD0PR07 – The Statement of Regulation 18 Consultation (Regulation 22(1)(c)(i-iv)document)
- SDPR10 – The Statement of Regulation 20 Consultation (Regulation 22(1)(c)(v)document)

1.10.3 Prior to submission, the Council attended a Planning Advisory Service Local Plan Route Mapper and Toolkit Workshop, which provided practical guidance in how to plan and manage a local plan review. It also assisted in helping the Council ensure that all relevant legislation and regulations and tests of soundness had been met. In addition, the Planning Policy team have been supported throughout the Plan preparation by the Council's in-house legal team and more detailed legal guidance and assistance has been provided by Counsel.

Matter 2 Housing

Issue 2 – Have the revisions to Policies DLF1 and H1 and relevant supporting text, in relation to housing needs and the housing requirement, been positively prepared and are they justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Q1. Policy DLF1 and its supporting text, in the Partial Review, seeks to set out the minimum housing requirement figure as a range of 6,895-8,715 dwellings for the plan period. Policy H1 and its supporting text, as proposed, seeks to set the housing requirement as 415 net new homes per annum between 2011 and 2019, and sets a range of 275-415 net new homes per annum between 2019 and 2032. The Partial Review also includes revisions to Paragraphs 9.13-9.19 on housing provision. My queries are:

a. Is the assessment of housing need, using the standard method, consistent with national policy and does it accord with the methodology set out in the Planning Practice Guidance? Are there any ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify an alternative approach?

2.1a.1 The assessment used for the Partial Review in the policies and paragraphs noted is derived from the assessment made in the Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper EDPR04. The assessment is made following the standard method in PPG, as applied at the time of Publication of the Partial Review. The Framework states that

To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance – unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.

2.1a.2 PPG clarifies:

“Is the use of the standard method for strategic policy making purposes mandatory? No, if it is felt that circumstances warrant an alternative approach but authorities can expect this to be scrutinised more closely at examination. There is an expectation that the standard method will be used and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.”

(Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 2a-003-20190220)

2.1a.3 The calculation set out in Table 1 (on page 9) of the Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper EDPR04 is the calculation for the year 2019-20. It takes the household growth projections for 2019-29 and the 2018 affordability ratio. This is consistent with the calculation of the LHN figure for 2019-20 made by MHCLG for the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) Results published in January 2021⁵; the HDT for the measurement year 2019-20 reduces the homes needed by one month in the year, so that the homes required is recalculated as $275 \times 335 / 366 = 251.7$ as shown on the MHCLG spreadsheet. (There is a reduction of 31 days and 2020 was a leap year).

2.1a.4 The calculation was made for the year 2019-20 as the latest data at the time of the preparation of the Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper and the Partial Review. All Partial

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/housing-delivery-test-2020-measurement>

Review documents were presented to the Council's Planning Committee for approval for publication in March 2020 immediately prior to the first Covid-19 lockdown period. However, publication could not take place as planned in March 2020 due to Covid-19 restrictions. The Council was able to publish the Partial Review for consultation on 23rd July 2020. The Council decided not to make any amendments to the Partial Review documents approved by the Council's Planning Committee in order to prevent further delay. However the Council notes that the representation made by Turley for Strategic Land Group includes a correct assessment of the LHN figure using the standard method for the year 2020-2021, which gives a result of 272. This corresponds with the illustrative figure the Council has produced in the Five Year Supply Position Statement Partial Review Version EL1.002c on page 18, and in other versions of the APS.

2.1a.5 A number of representors have made reference to the consultation draft revised standard method that was issued for consultation on 6th August 2020. Since the submission of the Partial Review for Examination on 21st October 2020, on 16th December 2020, the government's response to the consultation has been published⁶, along with revisions to the PPG which amended the standard method. The revised standard method that has been adopted by the government does not take up the proposed method from the consultation draft, and the method adopted is quite different. In consequence the Council considers that any calculations made based on the consultation draft standard method can be given no weight.

2.1a.6 Representors have suggested that in order to comply with the requirement in paragraph 31 of the Framework that *"The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence"* regard should be had to the 2018 household projections produced by the Office for National Statistics, irrespective of whether these form part of the standard method or not, and have made reference to another local plan examination where an inspector has asked the question as to what the implications of these projections are. PPG clarifies this matter in Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 2a-015-20190220, which states

"Any method which relies on using household projections more recently published than the 2014-based household projections will not be considered to be following the standard method as set out in paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework. As explained above, it is not considered that these projections provide an appropriate basis for use in the standard method."

The Council considers that, given this context, the 2018 household projections should not be considered relevant evidence.

2.1a.7 The revised standard method, as adopted, results in an unchanged calculation for Fylde from that set out in the Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper and incorporated into the Partial Review. The calculation of the revised standard method involves all of the same steps as are set out in the calculation made in Table 1 of the Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper EDPR04. For the largest cities and urban centres in the country, a further uplift is applied. This further uplift does not apply to Fylde; neither does it apply to any adjoining authority; within North West England it only currently applies to Manchester and Liverpool. Therefore, although the Council undertook its assessment in relation to the standard method as it applied at the time of making it, the assessment remains applicable in

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-current-planning-system/outcome/government-response-to-the-local-housing-need-proposals-in-changes-to-the-current-planning-system>

relation to the new adopted standard method, and therefore no references to transitional arrangements are required.

2.1a.8 Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 2a-015-20190220 of the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment PPG states that:

“Where a strategic policy-making authority can show that an alternative approach identifies a need higher than using the standard method, and that...” and “Where an alternative approach results in a lower housing need figure than that identified using the standard method, the strategic policy-making authority will need to demonstrate, using robust evidence, that...”.

Therefore, it is for the local planning authority to bring forward its preferred approach, not for an alternative approach to be proposed by representors and its soundness considered.

2.1a.9 The same passage of PPG confirms the soundness of the Council’s approach in adopting the standard method. It states:

“Where a strategic policy-making authority can show that an alternative approach identifies a need higher than using the standard method, and that it adequately reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals, the approach can be considered sound as it will have exceeded the minimum starting point.”

2.1a.10 The clear implication of this is that a calculation that exceeds the standard method calculation will be presumed to be sound.

2.1a.11 Only *“exceptional circumstances”* would justify the use of alternative approach, according to the Framework paragraph 60 and PPG. The circumstances of Fylde, where the calculation of housing need under the standard method is lower than the calculation made under an earlier assessment for an adopted plan is in no way exceptional. A significant majority of authorities in the North West have the same situation⁷. The Government, in bringing forward the standard method as its means of planning for the supply of 300,000 homes per annum nationally, clearly recognised this effect: the consultation on that proposed the standard method included a data table which illustrated the comparison between the standard method and existing adopted housing needs figures for each authority⁸.

2.1a.12 Certain representations have stated that the standard method figure only represents a baseline demographic need and that uplifts should be applied to this. Reference should be made to the points made by the Council in its responses to representations in SDPR10 Statement of Regulation 20 Consultation. However, in particular, the baseline demographic growth figure under the standard method is 253 per annum; which was close to the figure (256) used by the SHMA Addendum 3. The Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper EDPR04 paragraphs 2.13 to 2.15 provides a brief comparison of the calculations made for the standard method against that made for the SHMA.

2.1a.13 There is no justification in rejecting the standard method on the basis that the 2014-based projections are *“recessionary”* as described by some representors. The standard method as revised has been designed using the 2014-based projections as part of the government’s

⁷ <https://lichfields.uk/blog/2020/august/14/low-powerhouse-what-does-the-new-standard-method-mean-for-the-north-west/>, see the first and third columns in the table

⁸

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644783/Housing_Need_Consultation_Data_Table.xlsx

preferred strategy to boost significantly the supply of housing as a matter of national policy to deliver 300,000 homes per annum nationally. The 2014 household projections are trend-based, but are based on the years 2009-2014 i.e. the initial recovery following the recession in 2008. They do not derive directly from the household numbers at that time but are reflective of fertility, life expectancy and net migration trends and household representative rates, adjusted to the results of the 2011 census⁹. As noted above, PPG is unequivocal that only the 2014-based projections should be used.

2.1a.14 The standard method does not just reflect the baseline trend as stated by representors: uplift is applied to account for affordability, the purpose of which is to identify and deal with scarcity in the housing market which leaves homes unaffordable for those in the locality. The figure of 5.36 used in the calculation was corrected to 5.41 with the most recent data release, which gives a figure of 5.43 for the latest year (2019). This figure is not high when compared either nationally or within the region; for illustration, within the north west the figure for Ribble Valley is 7.04 and South Lakeland 9.49, whilst the only authorities significantly lower are those with relatively low demand, such as Burnley (4.08) and Blackpool (4.48). Nationally, Fylde is much more affordable than typical authorities in the Midlands (Blaby 8.13, Rugby 7.65) and far more affordable than the east and south (Cambridge 12.76, Brentwood 12.24, Central Bedfordshire 10.36). National policy applies significantly greater uplifts where there is scarcity in the marketplace leading to poor affordability, and a resulting need to address such market imbalances. The standard method calculation builds in an affordability uplift through the affordability ratio, and this is incorporated into the calculation for Fylde; greater uplifts are therefore unnecessary and are not justified.

2.1a.15 Representors have raised the issue of a potential uplift to provide affordable housing. The Framework paragraph 61 requires that housing needs of different groups need to be reflected within planning policies “*Within this context*”, *inter alia*, within the level of provision required as a minimum in paragraph 60. The standard method provides differently for affordability from the previous national policy. Rather than requiring separate uplifts to provide specifically for affordable housing, the standard method operates to make housing affordable, through its method of calculation, by incorporating an adjustment for affordability, which addresses scarcity in the housing market.

2.1a.16 Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 2a-010-20201216 of PPG, which deals with circumstances where it may be appropriate to plan for a higher figure than that calculated by the standard method, does not include the provision of affordable housing as one of the reasons why this would be justified.

2.1a.17 PPG Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 67-001-20190722 states:

How do the housing need of particular groups relate to overall housing need calculated using the standard method?

The standard method for assessing local housing need identifies an overall minimum average annual housing need figure but does not break this down into the housing need of individual groups. This guidance sets out advice on how plan-making authorities should identify and plan for the housing needs of particular groups of people.

This need may well exceed, or be proportionally high in relation to, the overall housing need figure calculated using the standard method. This is because the needs of particular

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/2014-based-household-projections-methodology>

groups will often be calculated having consideration to the whole population of an area as a baseline as opposed to the projected new households which form the baseline for the standard method.

2.1a.18 Therefore, it is not implied that the housing need figure should be augmented to include uplifts for special groups, including affordable housing; rather, the needs of individual groups would contained be within this total. This is confirmed at the end of the paragraph:

The household projections that form the baseline of the standard method are inclusive of all households

2.1a.19 Representations have noted Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 2a-010-20201216 of PPG which sets out circumstances where it may be appropriate to plan for a higher level of need. The circumstances set out are where there are likely to increased housing needs exceeding past trends due to:

- *“growth strategies for the area that are likely to be deliverable, for example where funding is in place to promote and facilitate additional growth (e.g. Housing Deals);”*
- *strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; or*
- *an authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground;*

There may, occasionally, also be situations where previous levels of housing delivery in an area, or previous assessments of need (such as a recently-produced Strategic Housing Market Assessment) are significantly greater than the outcome from the standard method. Authorities are encouraged to make as much use as possible of previously-developed or brownfield land, and therefore cities and urban centres, not only those subject to the cities and urban centres uplift may strive to plan for more home. Authorities will need to take this into account when considering whether it is appropriate to plan for a higher level of need than the standard model suggests.”

2.1a.20 There are no growth strategies of the type referred to. The existing Enterprise Zones are not likely to result in excess growth of housing need based on current information (this issue is dealt with more fully in the answer to question 2b).

2.1a.21 Representations have referred to the construction of the Preston Western Distributor Road: this will drive growth within Preston and will support the levels of growth already planned for within the FLP32, but is too far from the strategic locations for development to be a driver for growth beyond this within the plan period.

2.1a.22 As referred to under Issue 1a, the Council are providing a backstop position to ensure that housing need is met in the housing market area, but this is contingent on the outcome of the Wyre Partial Review, and therefore it is not considered appropriate to add it to the need figure at the outset.

2.1a.23 In respect of the previous assessment of need, the Framework makes clear that assessment of need should use the standard method. The Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper EDPR04 paragraphs 2.12 to 2.16 consider how the various elements of the previous assessment of need are superseded by and provided for within the standard method. However, the Council intends to provide for the delivery of the amount of housing identified

through the outmoded figure from the SHMA by the use of the housing requirement as a range.

- 2.1a.24 In respect of higher levels of delivery, it is correct that housing delivery has significantly risen in the Borough. This reflects delivery of sites allocated in the Local Plan, and underdelivery in the earlier part of the plan period. The Partial Review housing requirement, together with retention of all allocations and windfalls from the FLP32 will support this continued level of delivery, but the annual delivery figures for the last years should not form a new benchmark assessment of need as it reflects the making up of the earlier shortfall.
- 2.1a.25 None of the above factors constitute the *exceptional circumstances* that are required to justify departure from the standard method. The level of need identified using the standard method is therefore justified and compliant with up-to-date national policy.

b. Is the inclusion of a minimum housing requirement figure as a range justified and effective?

- 2.1b.1 The Framework states that “*strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement*” (paragraph 65). The Council has established that the housing requirement should be 275-415 for the period 2019-2032. The determination of the range of 275-415 as the housing requirement figure is set out in EDPR04, the Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper.
- 2.1b.2 It is recognised in PPG that it may be appropriate to plan for a housing requirement expressed as a range. Within the Housing Supply and Delivery PPG, Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 68-027-20190722 states: “*How is 5 year housing land supply measured where authorities set out their housing requirements as a range? Where strategic policy-makers have successfully argued through plan-making and examination for a requirement set out as a range, the 5 year land supply will be measured against the lower end of the range.*” Therefore, there is no principle against the use of a range within national policy and guidance.
- 2.1b.3 The proposed housing requirement expressed as a range will meet identified housing needs. The Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper identifies the local housing need figure to be 275 dwellings per annum. The housing requirement takes this for the lower end of the range, and ensures that the plan is justified and positively prepared.
- 2.1b.4 The justification for the upper end of the range is to ensure that the remainder of the existing FLP32, including in particular the allocation policies SL1-SL5 and the development strategy DLF1, remain consistent with the revised housing requirement. The FLP32 incorporating the revised requirement in the Partial Review will be effective: the allocated sites and windfall sites in accordance with the development strategy will continue to be brought forward and ensure housing will be delivered in accordance with the plan.
- 2.1b.5 The use of the range, with the upper end using the existing figure from the FLP32, ensures that further amendments to the parts of the plan that the Council does not propose to alter, would not be justified. It ensures that the Council is justified in maintaining all existing allocated sites within the plan, and supports the retention of the windfall allowance. Contrary to the comments of some representors, the requirement therefore does not involve a reduction in housing delivery.

2.1b.6 Representations have made the point that the effect of the lower end of the revised housing requirement will be to lower the requirement figure used for the five-year housing land supply. This is correct and consistent with the approach outlined in the PPG. It will have the effect of protecting the plan, in line with the stated purpose of the Framework to create a plan-led system, underpinning the delivery of the key strategic sites. This will ensure that the delivery of the large strategic sites in the plan is not undermined by the approval at appeal of a plethora of less sustainable sites and small sites that are not in accordance with the development strategy. The revised housing requirement as a range will therefore support the delivery of the FLP32, as amended through the Partial Review, supporting its significant boost to the supply of housing in Fylde, and is therefore positively prepared, justified, effective and compliant with national policy.

c. Why is 'minimum' proposed to be deleted from Policy H1 criterion a) in relation to the housing requirement figure? Is this consistent with Policy DLF1?

2.1c.1 The word 'minimum' was removed in constructing the revised policy which introduces the annual housing requirement expressed as a range. It was considered that the use of minimum in conjunction with the annual requirement expressed as a range would raise questions on the semantics, specifically, which figure is the minimum? It also avoids the contention that, if one figure is the minimum, the other must be the maximum (it is not). It is noted that in response to the revised Policy DLF1, a representor has made this point. "Minimum" can be restored if necessary for soundness but other editing may be needed to ensure clarity.

2.1c.2 The reason for the range is to identify the lower figure which meets housing needs and against which the five-year housing land supply will be measured henceforth, and the higher figure which identifies the number which meets the broad spatial objectives of the plan. Neither is a maximum figure.

2.1c.3 In order to assist with resolving these issues of terminology, some possible alternative text is provided below for consideration:

Policy DLF1

The Local Plan will provide sites for ~~a minimum of at least 6,895 new homes to provide for identified housing needs and at least 8,715 new homes to deliver the planned development strategy;~~ and a minimum of 60.6 Ha (gross requirement) of additional employment land over the plan period to 31 March 2032.

Paragraph 9.14

The Framework requires that strategic policy-making authorities establish a housing requirement figure for the whole area (the Borough of Fylde), showing the extent to which the identified needs (and any that cannot be met in neighbouring areas) can be met. For the Local Plan, the Council had considered the findings of Addendum 3 to the SHMA and determined the housing requirement for the 2011-2032 plan period to be 415 net dwellings per annum. For the Partial Review of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032, having considered the existence of this adopted figure and the evidence provided by the Housing Needs and Requirement Background Paper 2020 using the government's standard method for housing

need, the Council has determined the housing requirement figure for the plan period to be 6,895-8,715 net dwellings. This is derived from an annual requirement of 415 net dwellings for the period 2011-2019 and an annual requirement as a range of 275-415 net dwellings per annum from 2019-20 onwards. The lower figure of at least 275 net dwellings per annum provides for housing needs to be met; the higher figure of at least 415 net dwellings per annum ensures the delivery of the planned development strategy. This revised housing requirement allows account to be taken of any need from neighbouring authorities that cannot be met, up to the amount of unmet need from the adopted Wyre Local Plan (2011-2031), should any need that cannot be met exist following Wyre's Partial Review. ~~This~~ ~~The~~ higher total figure of ~~415~~ ~~6,895~~ ~~8,715 net dwellings per annum~~ has been used to determine how much deliverable land is allocated in the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 which covers the period from 1 April 2011 – 31 March 2032, this is known as the planned provision. Fylde Council's role is to address the imperative of housing provision as positively as possible.

Paragraph 9.15

Councils are required to have a five year supply of housing land available. In accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance, the lower figure of the housing requirement range, 275 net dwellings per annum, will be used as the requirement against which the five-year housing land supply will be measured. Where an authority is unable to demonstrate a five year supply, applications for housing development will be decided with regard to the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' contained within ~~paragraph 14~~ of the Framework. Unless there is an overriding reason why an application should be refused, the Council may find it difficult to resist development which it may consider unsuitable for other reasons. The housing supply will be reviewed at least annually as part of the Council's Authority Monitoring Report and Housing Land Supply Statement.

Policy H1

The Council will provide for and manage the delivery of new housing by:

- a) Setting and applying a ~~minimum~~ housing requirement of at least 415 net homes per annum for the ~~plan period 2011-2032~~2019 and a housing requirement of at least 275-415 net homes per annum for the period 2019-2032.*
- b) Keeping under review housing delivery performance on the basis of rolling 3 year completion levels as set out in accordance with the Monitoring Framework at Appendix 8.*
- c) Ensuring there is enough deliverable land suitable for house building capable of providing a continuous 5 year supply calculated using the "Liverpool" method from the start of each annual monitoring period and in locations that are in line with the Policy **DLF1** (Development Locations for Fylde) and suitable for developments that will provide the range and mix of house types necessary to meet the requirements of the Local Plan.*
- d) The delivery of the developable sites, which are allocated for housing and mixed use from 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2032 and provided for through allowances, to provide for a minimum of 6,895 homes to provide for housing needs and at least 8,715 homes to deliver the planned development strategy.*

d. Overall, are proposed Policies DLF1 and H1 soundly based? Are they clearly written and unambiguous in accordance with paragraph 16 d) of the Framework, and supported by effective explanatory text?

- 2.1d.1 Policies DLF1 and H1 are soundly based. The revised housing requirement is justified, meeting identified housing needs whilst maintaining the aspiration to deliver the level of housing planned for in the FLP32; it is effective, as the plan as a whole will ensure the delivery of the requirement over the plan period; it is positively prepared, seeking to meet needs including any unmet need that cannot be met, and it is compliant with national policy.
- 2.1d.2 The policies are clearly written and unambiguous, incorporating the revised housing requirement range into the policies in an appropriate way, distinguishing between the earlier part of the plan period and that going forward.
- 2.1d.3 Paragraph 9.17 sets out the implications of the amended housing requirement over the plan period, in relation to delivery. Delivery in the early years of the plan period is subtracted from the totals at either end of the range to give a residual requirement of 5,357-7,177 as a range. Whilst these totals are correct, it may be helpful to clarify this paragraph. The requirement as a range only applies from 2019 onwards. The figure of 357 within the residual range of 357-479 is derived from the division over the years 2017-2032 of the lower of the range of the residual plan period requirement (5,357). However, the residual requirement of 479 applied from 2017-2019. The Five Year Supply Position Statement Partial Review Version EL1.002c paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 explain how the lower end residual figure (and that used for the purposes of calculating the five year housing land supply) should be 339. Therefore, it may improve clarity to state that “this equates to 339-479 for the remaining years of the plan period 2019-2032” in paragraph 9.17 of the Partial Review.
- 2.1d.4 In all other respects, the supporting text is considered effective in explaining the revised policies.

Q2. What effect, if any, does a minimum housing requirement as a range of 6,895-8,715 net new homes during the plan period, have on the ability of the Council to:

a. deliver affordable housing to meet identified needs; and

- 2.2a.1 The Partial Review minimum housing requirement as a range of 6,895-8,715 does not change the ability of the Council to deliver affordable housing to meet identified needs. The minimum housing requirement, as part of the FLP32 as revised through the Partial Review, will support the delivery of the sites allocated and allowances made for development in accordance with the development strategy in the plan, and this will result in the delivery of affordable housing associated with those developments in accordance with the other existing policies of the plan.
- 2.2a.2 The allocations within the plan which will be supported going forward under the revised policies are ensuring affordable housing delivery, recently in excess of expectations. In 2017-18, 121 affordable homes were delivered in Fylde¹⁰; in 2018-19, 232 affordable homes were

¹⁰ EDPR07 <https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/14.-EDPR07-Fylde-Council-Housing-Land-Availability-Schedule-2019.pdf>

delivered¹¹; in 2019-20, 227 homes were delivered¹². These numbers are in excess of the 120-130 affordable dwellings per annum anticipated in the Inspector's Report to the FLP32.

- 2.2a.3 As noted in the response to Issue 2 question 1b., representations have made the point that the effect of the lower end of the revised housing requirement will be to lower the requirement figure used for the five-year housing land supply. This will ensure that the affordable housing delivered through the large strategic sites is not undermined by the approval at appeal of a plethora of small sites that are not in accordance with the development strategy and many of which would be exempted from the requirement to deliver affordable housing.
- 2.2a.4 The Partial Review plans for the delivery of at least 8,715 dwellings through the upper end of the housing requirement range. The delivery of affordable housing will principally come from the strategic sites which are allocated in the plan and which the Partial Review will support coming forward. Almost all of these sites have at least outline planning permission already. The Partial Review will support these sites being developed and ensure that the affordable housing delivered on those sites is secured. Similarly, sites permitted through the windfall allowance within the plan will be required to provide affordable housing in line with the existing policy. In addition the Council is supporting the delivery of 100% affordable schemes on suitable previously-developed sites funded through off-site contributions.

b. achieve its economic ambitions to deliver growth, specifically employment provision and jobs, in line with the overall strategy for the Borough?

- 2.2b.1 The Partial Review minimum housing requirement as a range of 6,895-8,715 does not change the ability of the Council to achieve its economic ambitions for the Borough. It supports the delivery of all of the existing allocations and allowances in the FLP32, and therefore it maintains the support which the housing growth within the plan gives to the employment growth aims for the Borough.
- 2.2b.2 The representation from Turley for Strategic Land Group makes reference to jobs growth figures for Blackpool Airport Enterprise Zone included within the minutes of the Economic Prosperity Board that is operated jointly by the Fylde Coast authorities. The overall jobs growth figure of 1,520 is a gross figure, as noted in the representation: it includes new jobs to the area, safeguarded jobs (i.e. existing displaced from other locations within the boroughs) and construction jobs (which are temporary).
- 2.2b.3 Up-to date information on the jobs created within the EZ as a whole shows approximately 1,639 gross (including displacement) but excluding construction, and 525 new jobs, not including construction. These jobs occur in either Blackpool or Fylde segments of the EZ. Approximately 364 of the new jobs have been created in the Fylde segment (the new jobs are disproportionately within Fylde whereas transfers of existing jobs are disproportionately in the Blackpool segment).
- 2.2b.4 The Blackpool Airport EZ straddles the boundary of Fylde and Blackpool. Growth from the EZ will contribute to the achievement of the strategies for both boroughs. The FLP32 includes the allocation of 14.5 ha of employment land within the EZ; this is provided to meet identified

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Housing Land Availability Schedule, March 2020 (update of EDPR07) <https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Housing-Land-Availabilty-Schedule-March-2020.pdf>

needs within the plan period. The FLP32 provides 14 ha of employment land from the allocations to provide for unmet need in Blackpool. Although which land is provided for this purpose is not identified, clearly those allocations closest to Blackpool provide this to greatest effect, and therefore an element of any employment growth on allocated land in Fylde within the EZ can be considered to be to fulfil growth projections for Blackpool. The regeneration impacts of the EZ on mitigating the high levels of unemployment and deprivation in Blackpool is a key aim of the EZ. Putting this aside, jobs created in Fylde will contribute towards the overall jobs growth projection for Fylde, which is supported by the housing requirement 6,895-8,715 in the Partial Review. In this respect it should be noted that NOMIS jobs density data¹³ identify a growth from 45,000 jobs in Fylde in 2011 to 49,000 in 2014 and 2016 but falling back to 47,000 in 2019. The level of jobs growth in the EZ is not a policy-led acceleration which would justify by itself a further review of the housing requirement.

- 2.2b.5 The Masterplan for the development of the Blackpool Airport EZ, which was published in draft at the time of the FLP32 Examination, showed three phases of development. The first phase, which has involved development through the relocation of the airport terminal buildings, is progressing but has been largely within Blackpool. The second phase was to be the redevelopment of the very large building known as the Wellington Bomber Factory, but due to a change of ownership this will not now go ahead: there will be jobs created but in relatively small numbers through the bringing back of the whole building into use, but 128 jobs have been lost as the former tenant has vacated the building. Phase three will in consequence be brought forward, involving the construction of the spine road, relocation of sports pitches into the green belt and the redevelopment of the land so released. The third phase will partly be within Fylde, but there is considerable work to be done before any sites will be available for occupiers, and planning permission has not yet been granted for the spine road.
- 2.2b.6 Whilst there has been growth in jobs at the Blackpool Airport EZ, and sites are being brought forward, the level of growth is only within the anticipated levels and does not justify a review of the Local Plan strategy.
- 2.2b.7 The representation by Pegasus Group for Hallam Land Management refers to the anticipated growth in the Lancashire Advanced Manufacturing and Engineering Cluster (LAMEC) at the Warton Aviation EZ. Whilst considerable growth has taken place within the cluster, there has been little change in the amount of activity at the Warton site, and growth has been concentrated in particular at the Samlesbury site between Preston and Blackburn to the east of Preston on the A59, 13.1 km from the eastern boundary of the Borough. Construction of the Preston Western Distributor Road (PWDR) is taking place. The PWDR supports the level of growth already proposed for Warton in the FLP32, but is more than 6 km away from the settlement; local growth that it will promote is located within Preston, where it supports a large strategic area of growth adjacent to it and connected to it by the East-West Link Road, and Cottam Link Road, also provided as part of the scheme. The delivery of the PWDR was known at the time of the Examination of the FLP32¹⁴ and its effect is already recognised within the FLP32.

¹³ <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157093/report.aspx#tabjobs> , the table is at https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157093/subreports/jd_time_series/report.aspx?

¹⁴ <https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/5-Fylde-Local-Plan-to-2032-Inspector-s-Final-Report-including-Appendix.pdf> , paragraph 77

- 2.2b.8 The growth on both EZ sites, and throughout the Borough, is supported by the existing level of housing growth in the plan. The monitoring framework provides triggers in the event that growth exceeds expectations. The issue will be considered at full plan review stage, when an update and reassessment of the economic strategy will be required.
- 2.2b.9 The Partial Review housing requirement will fully support and underpin the delivery of the housing allocations and allowances made in the FLP32 and thereby continue to support the achievement of the Borough's ambitions for economic growth.

Q3. The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) definition for older people differs from that in the 2012 version in that it now also includes people 'approaching retirement age'. Is Policy H2 and its supporting text, which includes specific requirements for 'Specialist Accommodation for the Elderly', consistent with this revised definition? Specifically, do the criteria in the policy for defining what development type is 'purpose-built 100% specialist accommodation for the elderly', accord with national policy and the guidance set out in the Planning Practice Guidance?

- 2.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) definition for older people differs from that in the 2012 version in that it now also includes people 'approaching retirement age', it also deletes the reference to those looking to downsize.
- 2.3.2 Policy H2 does refer to over 55s, which is a valid local definition of 'approaching retirement age', especially as the state pension age is rising. Reference to providing housing for people who are downsizing is not a material change to the policy as it simply singled out one particular group, narrowing accessible adaptable general needs housing to only those who are downsizing, when they could be moving from a similar size property, a smaller home or returning to the community from a specialist care home etc.
- 2.3.3 Therefore, the Council concludes that Policy H2 and its supporting text, which includes specific requirements for 'Specialist Accommodation for the Elderly' is consistent with this revised definition.
- 2.3.4 Policy H2 and its justification also complies with all of the relevant guidance in the PGG on Housing for Older and Disabled People.
- 2.3.5 The main aim of the section of H2 entitled Specialist Accommodation for the Elderly is to deal with a particularly exceptional ongoing issue that is evidenced from paragraph 9.40 of the justification. For Fylde as a proportion the population aged 65 and over represents more than 28% of the total population, compared to 16.3% across England. The number of people 65 and over is predicted to increase by 41.2% (2011 to 2030). This exceeds the predicted increase in the overall population.
- 2.3.6 In addition, over one-third of all the increase in population in Fylde will be due to an increase in the number of people aged 85 and over. Consequently, the number of older people with support needs will increase significantly.
- 2.3.7 The population 65 and over unable to manage at least one self-care activity on their own will increase from 6,778 to 9,625 (by 42%) with a moderate or severe visual impairment will increase from 1,780 to 2,499 (by 40%) and unable to manage at least one mobility activity on

their own will increase from 3,742 to 5,437 (by 45%). These projections show that there will be significant growth in the numbers with support needs in Fylde.

- 2.3.8 The accommodation occupied by people 65 and over in Fylde varies widely, 42% live in homes of three or more bedrooms. 17% live in flats mainly in Lytham St Annes. In total there are 5,707 purpose built flats in Fylde, but only a very small proportion of these are purpose built for the elderly. Many of the flats in Fylde are occupied by younger people as a stepping stone to home ownership.
- 2.3.9 The existing stock of accommodation designed/marketed specifically to the elderly consists of 1,072 units of sheltered accommodation, most of which is suitable for couples. Of these 97 are extra care units. In addition, there are 40 care homes providing space for 1115 residents. Therefore, if there were no further developments of these types, the amount of accommodation intended to provide for the needs of the elderly (3,356 bed spaces) would be sufficient for just 11% of the population aged 65 and over at the end of the plan period (30,311).
- 2.3.10 The data in paragraphs 2.3.5- 2.3.9 above demonstrate that there are going to be very high increases in the percentages of over 65s with the three different types of support needs. 31% of the population 65 and over will be unable to manage at least one self-care activity on their own by 2030.
- 2.3.11 People will choose accommodation based on their own preferences and subject to their budgets. However, the provision of a greater supply of accommodation that better reflects the needs of the high numbers of over 65s in Fylde is desirable in providing for the health and wellbeing of the older population.
- 2.3.12 Purpose-built Specialist Accommodation for the Elderly (FLP32) is defined as having to meet 6 separate requirements, if 100% specialist accommodation for the elderly is proposed as defined by the Policy then affordable housing contributions will not be sought.
- 2.3.13 These requirements were subject to viability appraisal and were found to be viable.
- 2.3.14 Paragraph:010 Reference ID:63-010-20190626 of PPG Specialist Housing for Older People is guidance not policy, within the bullets it includes the words "*there are different types... which can include...*" and then they start "*usually...*"; therefore this is illustrative and not meant to restrict the Local Planning Authority to any particular type of housing, they are simply examples of different types of housing.
- 2.3.15 Fylde Council's list of criteria required for development to be considered purpose-built 100% specialist accommodation for the elderly combines aspects of bullets two and three. Bullet one is not included because it does not include providing any support or care. The evidence set out above clarifies the dramatically increasing need for supported living and care, age restricted general market housing would not meet this specific need. Care homes fit into Fylde's list of criteria for purpose-built 100% specialist accommodation for the elderly and do have statutory requirements to provide care outside planning legislation.
- 2.3.16 Nowhere in the PPG does it say that a Local Planning Authority cannot combine the various types of specialist housing if the evidence demonstrates that a particular type of specialised housing is demonstrated to be needed and Policy H2 has been written to achieve that outcome.

- 2.3.17 With respect to the response made by Applethwaite Homes, the response requests that all four types of specialist housing for older people are described as 'purpose built', this does not accord with the wording in the PPG which only describes them as specialist housing for older people. Inserting the words 'purpose built' before that section of the PPG makes it look as though the PPG describes age restricted market housing as purpose-built which it does not.
- 2.3.18 If the Council were to change the text in the plan to that requested by Applethwaite Homes then affordable housing contributions would not be sought in relation to their type of development. They would also be exempt from the requirement to provide 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership as part of the overall affordable housing contribution from the site as set out in NPPF (paragraph 64d).
- 2.3.19 The Council's affordable housing 'break' is intended to incentivise the provision of purpose-built 100% specialist accommodation for the elderly and improve its viability, which will increase its supply thereby providing the levels of care and support needed for the increasing numbers of elderly people in Fylde.

Matter 3 Other revisions

Issue 3 – Are the other proposed revisions in the Partial Review soundly based?

Q1. In relation to development in the countryside, is revised Policy GD4 and its supporting text, positively prepared, consistent with national policy, justified and effective? In particular:

a. Does it support and enable a prosperous rural economy in accordance with paragraphs 83-84 of the Framework?

- 3.1a.1 With respect to Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy in the Framework, the bullets supporting a prosperous rural economy in paragraph 83 have simply been summarised in the Framework resulting in no change to the FLP32. Paragraph 84 is new text and has resulted in revisions to Policy GD4 to reflect the changes introduced by that new text. Policy GD4 did already support a prosperous rural economy. Paragraph 84 recognises that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. The first revision of criterion a) includes inserting meeting local business and community needs at the beginning of the list of types of development that will be permitted in the countryside. The second addition to criterion a) is the addition of wording stating that development should be sensitive to its surroundings, must not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and must exploit any opportunity to make the location more sustainable.
- 3.1a.2 A representor has suggested that the Council's proposed change to Policy GD4 is not positively prepared, nor justified and takes a negative approach to development by creating greater restrictions than the original policy. In this case, they have alleged that the Council has misinterpreted paragraph 84 of the NPPF and thus the proposed change does not support and enable a prosperous rural economy in accordance with paragraphs 83-84 of the Framework. The respondent suggests that the new text, underlined here: 'that needed for purposes of meeting local business and community needs, for the purposes of agriculture, horticulture or forestry.....' would limit development as the proposal would have to meet local business or community needs only and would not allow for development that did not necessarily meet local need.
- 3.1a.3 As explained in greater detail in document SDPR10, the addition is a significant change between the NPPF12 and NPPF19. These words have therefore been added to criterion a). The comma between the words 'needs' and 'for' makes it clear that these local business and community needs are one category of development and agriculture, horticulture or forestry etc are another. The local business and community needs can be for any use that falls under that definition, and not necessarily agriculture, forestry or horticulture as suggested by the representor. Therefore, no additional restrictions are imposed as a result of this.
- 3.1a.4 Additionally, the respondent suggests that there is no justification for the retention of the words 'small-scale' in respect of tourist accommodation and 'very exceptionally, larger scale' in relation to tourism development as this approach is not supported in paragraph 83 of NPPF. It is stated that the retention of these size parameters is not justified to any degree and the unchanged wording of the condition would suggest that small scale tourism development (which was not accommodation) would not be acceptable but large scale potentially would be. The respondent believes that a reasonable alternative would have been for policy GD4 to

not refer to scale and this alternative approach would be justified by the controls administered via other policies in the plan and NPPF.

- 3.1a.5 However, the wording in relation to scale was included in the adopted FLP32 in order that the FLP32 would comply with paragraph 83 of the NPPF, in particular the references to sustainable growth and expansion and sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments. The wording of Paragraph 83 has not changed from NPPF12 to NPPF19 it has simply been reformatted. The word 'sustainable' does relate to the size of enterprises therefore the use of size parameters is entirely justified.
- 3.1a.6 As the representor acknowledges, paragraph 83 of the of the NPPF is clear that policies should enable the growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas.
- 3.1a.7 The Council consider that the addition to the policy, along with the retention of the original text regarding 'scale', is positively prepared and justified, according with the text of Paragraphs 83 and 84 by ensuring that local business and community needs can be met through Policy GD4. It is therefore consistent with national policy in supporting and enabling a prosperous rural economy and in achieving sustainable development as defined in the NPPF.

b. Is it consistent with national policy on rural housing (paragraphs 77-79 of the Framework)?

- 3.1b.1 The starting point for the Council's response is that Policy GD4 of the FLP32, which sets out policy and supporting text in relation to development in the countryside as part of the wider FLP32 development strategy was found to be positively prepared, consistent with national policy, justified and effective.
- 3.1b.2 Sites are allocated in the seven sustainable rural settlements identified in the settlement hierarchy as Tier 1: Larger Rural Settlements and Tier 2: Smaller Rural Settlements: these are included within the settlement boundaries of those settlements and fall outside Policy GD4. Minor infill is permitted provided it is of a scale and use that does not have a material impact on the rural character of the area and does not conflict with Policy ENV3. The policy is sound, as before, but needs to be considered within the context of the whole FLP32 development strategy. In this broad context, the 2012 and 2019 wording of the Framework is substantially the same.
- 3.1b.3 National policy on rural housing (paragraphs 77-79 of the Framework) replaced paragraphs 54-55 of NPPF12, the changes were as follows:
- Minor change to previous paragraph 54 NPPF12 on rural exception sites;
 - Previous Paragraph 55 now 78, text altered to say planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby;
 - Paragraph 79 contains the additional bullet about the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling.
- 3.1b.4 No change was made with respect to the minor change to the previous paragraph 54, and in any case the FLP32 does not contain rural exception sites. With respect to paragraph 78, the FLP32 identifies opportunities for villages to grow and thrive by allocating sites for housing at

the seven sustainable rural settlements identified in the settlement hierarchy, minor infill development is also permitted if it is of a scale and use that does not have a material impact on the rural character of the area and does not conflict with the provisions of Policy ENV3. Finally, Paragraph 79 contains the additional bullet d) which as an exception permits the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling to create an isolated home in the countryside.

- 3.1b.5 GD4 Development in the Countryside limits development in the countryside to six separate categories, one of which is e) isolated new homes in the countryside which meet the criteria set out in Policy H6. The additional bullet – subdivision of an existing residential dwellings, which has been added to paragraph 79 of the Framework has been included as a revision to Policy H6 Isolated New Homes the Countryside. The revisions proposed to Policies GD4 and Policy H6 ensure that Policy GD4 is consistent with national policy on rural housing (paragraphs 77-79 of the Framework) and remains positively prepared, justified and effective.

c. The Partial Review proposes to include a new criterion on entry-level exception sites for first-time buyers. Is this consistent with paragraph 71 of the Framework and is it justified and effective?

- 3.1c.1 Finally, with respect to paragraph 71 of the framework, this is new policy to allow the development of exception sites to provide entry-level housing for first-time buyers (and renters) on land not already allocated for housing.
- 3.1c.2 They should comprise of entry level homes that offer one or more types of affordable housing (Annex 2 of Framework). They should also be adjacent to existing settlements, proportionate in size to them, not compromise the protection given to assets of importance in the Framework, and comply with any local design policies and standards.
- 3.1c.3 An additional criterion g has been added as a revision to Policy GD4. However, to ensure that the policy is clear in referring to entry-level exception sites as defined through the criteria in the Framework, a small alteration is suggested to the proposed additional criterion as follows:
- g) development needed to support entry-level exception sites for first time buyers (or those looking to rent their own home) on land not already allocated for housing which meets the criteria set out in the Framework and Policy GD7.*
- 3.1c.4 This ensures consistency with national policy in the Framework on rural housing. The reference to GD7 Achieving Good Design in Development ensures compliance with local design policies and standards. Policy GD4 as amended remains positively prepared, justified, effective and in accordance with the Framework.

Q2. In relation to Coastal Change Management Areas, is Policy ENV1, as proposed in the Partial Review, consistent with paragraphs 167-168 of the Framework? Is the proposed revised wording in criterion iii justified and effective?

- 3.2.1 Policy ENV1 of the adopted FLP32 was found to be positively prepared, consistent with national policy, justified and effective.
- 3.2.2 The revised wording in criterion iii is comprised of text in paragraph 174 criterion b) of NPPF19. The addition is as set out below:

~~iii. Does not adversely affect the nature conservation assets~~ Promotes the conservation, restoration and enhancement of the coastline, predominantly the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA/Ramsar. Project specific Habitats Regulations Assessments (HRAs) will be required for any tourism and coastal defence developments near to the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA/Ramsar. The HRAs will need to demonstrate that there will be no likely significant effect upon European Sites before the tourism and coastal defence developments can be granted consent.

- 3.2.3 The revision has been made to reflect the wording of the NPPF which relates to achieving measurable net gain in biodiversity. The context of criterion iii is the same, but elevates the importance of conserving, restoring and enhancing the coastline, rather than development just having no adverse effects. This is supported in Fylde Council's Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document. More detail on the Biodiversity Supplementary Document is provided in response to question 3 below. One representation was received in response to this proposed revised working of criterion iii. This was in support of the alteration.
- 3.2.4 This remains consistent with national policy (paragraphs 167 and 168 of NPPF19) through setting out the manner of acceptable development in a Coastal Change Management Area and thus ensuring that Policy ENV1 remains justified and effective.

Q3. Is revised Policy ENV2 and its supporting text, soundly based, or is it necessary to include additional details on both the qualitative aspect of net gain and on off-site or on-site provision?

3.3.1 Fylde Council adopted a Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)¹⁵ on the 11th September 2019. This SPD was requested by Natural England at an early stage of plan production in order to provide more detailed information than is provided by FLP32. The SPD is intended to provide supplementary guidance to ENV2.

3.3.2 Paragraph 7.35 of the SPD states

'In addition, proposals are to be encouraged that will enhance, restore or add to features or habitats used by protected species. The assessment should also give an indication of how species numbers are likely to change, if at all, after development. The PPG contains guidance on how Biodiversity 'net gain' can be calculated by assessing habitat.

3.3.3 Additional detail is also provided from paragraphs 7.62 onwards.

Enhancement of Development Sites (Net Gain)

7.62 The Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and the Local Plan Biodiversity policy (policy ENV2) seek the enhancement of sites and a net gain in biodiversity. Biodiversity net gain complements and works with the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy set out in the NPPF. It does not override the protection for designated sites, protected or priority species and irreplaceable or priority habitats set out in the NPPF. Developers need to ensure that

¹⁵ [Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf](#)

habitat improvement will be a genuine additional benefit and go further than measures already required to implement a mitigation/compensation strategy.

7.63 Proposals should be encouraged that will enhance, restore or add to designated sites, priority habitats, other biodiversity or geological features, or which will enhance or restore ecological networks.

7.64 Developers should look to design in opportunities to improve habitats for biodiversity conservation, and to increase the overall quality of the biodiversity of the development by enhancing existing habitats or creating new areas appropriate to the wider landscape context and also to create new links to the ecological network beyond the development site.

- 3.3.4 Appendix 6 of the SPD Dealing with Ecological issues in the Planning process references achieving net gain and a definition of net gain is included in the glossary.
- 3.3.5 Fylde Council has not gone as far as including additional details on both the qualitative aspect of net gain and on off site or on- site provision in the revisions to the Local Plan, mainly because this detail is not included in the Framework. The Council was hoping that biodiversity net gain would become a legal requirement while the SPD was being written. However, this did not happen therefore the Council went as far as it could with respect to requesting net gain by referencing the PPG in the SPD and writing the details above into the SPD. The Council considers it helpful to cross reference the SPD in the reasoned justification. A cross reference could be achieved via a minor modification.

Q4. Are all other revisions consistent with national policy?

- 3.4.1 The main objective of all of the other revisions, which are not referenced in the Inspector's MIQs was to revise the FLP32 to reflect policy changes which the replacement framework has made in accordance with Annex 1: Implementation of the Framework.
- 3.4.2 The schedule of revisions was produced by considering and combining two separate spreadsheets of the differences between NPPF12, 18 and the Framework. A paragraph by paragraph comparison is not always possible as paragraphs from NPPF12 have been deleted and paragraph numbers have changed, although it was attempted in a methodical way. This resulted in a final spreadsheet which was used to produce the schedule of revisions. The schedule of revisions defined the scope of the Partial Review along with paragraph 1.27 of FLP32 which has been covered in the MIQs.
- 3.4.3 The schedule of revisions has been consulted on at Publication and Submission stages. All of the comments on the revisions have been taken into account in refining the scope of the Partial Review, in so far as they accorded with the scope which has purposely been kept to the two original objectives.
- 3.4.4 The Council has made all the necessary revisions needed to make the Partial Review of the FLP32 accord with the Framework. The Council considers that all of the other revisions accord with national policy.

Appendix 1

Minutes of Fylde Coast Duty to Cooperate Officers' Meeting 12th March 2019

Duty to Cooperate (DtC)

Fylde Coast Authorities and Lancashire County Council

Tuesday 12 March 2019

14.00-16.00pm

Fylde Council

Porritt Room, St. Annes Town Hall

MINUTES

Attendees:

Fylde Council: Mark Evans (ME), Julie Glaister (JG), Eddie Graves (EG), Steph Shone (SS)

Blackpool Council: Jane Saleh (JS), Stephen Lamb (SL)

Wyre Council: David Thow (DT)

Lancashire County Council: Richard Sharples (RS)

1 Introductions and Apologies

1.1 Apologies received from Len Harris (LH) and Rea Psillidou (RP)

2 Minutes of the last meeting (13/11/18)

2.1 JS amended paragraph 5.2 of the minutes.

2.2 SL to make amendment.

3 Matters arising

3.1 No comments

4 Blackpool Local Plan 2012-2027 Part 2 Informal Consultation Paper Draft Allocations and Development Management Policies – Consultation update

4.1 Informal consultation on Part 2: Site allocations and development management policies closed on the 21 February 2019. 74 representations were received, 35 were specific representations objecting to a travellers site on Faraday Way.

4.2 Issues raised concerned:

- Location
- Impact on highway
- Ecology and loss of trees
- Potential for anti-social behaviour
- Other non-planning issues

- 4.3 LH had spoken to SL to say that Wyre would be putting in an objection to Faraday Way.
- 4.4 JS informed the group of the situation and highlighted that it has been very difficult to find sites. There is a need to balance the land available and the requirements for travellers' sites going forward. Further highways and ecology work is needed, this consultation was just an informal consultation to gather peoples' thoughts and ideas. There have been planning applications for Gypsy and Traveller Sites for the Moss, so demand may be reduced but the site will still be needed.
- 4.5 Two objections from Sport England were received as a result of the loss of playing fields associated with three proposed housing allocations including EZ proposals.
- 4.6 Additional representations were also received regarding the proposed local threshold for assessing impact of proposed retail development.
- 4.7 JS discussed the possibility of changing the countryside area between Staining and Blackpool to Green Belt. Discussions involved whether this would be considered a local or strategic change. If it is a local change then it could be done in Part 2. However, if it is strategic then it will have to wait for a review of the Core Strategy.
- 4.8 ME/DT and EG said that the purpose of Green Belt is to maintain the separation of towns, and so it has to be considered strategic.
- 4.9 JS informed the group that they are making progress in dealing with representations, but have been slower due to a planning inquiry. Blackpool are hoping for to publish by autumn and submit by the end of the year. JS stated that a representation document will be published even though it was an informal consultation.
- 4.10 The initial verbal feedback from the Sustainability Appraisal was positive.
- 4.11 A viability assessment has not yet been commissioned due to potential updates by ORS on affordable housing and other contributions. JS highlighted that they wish to have all the information before commissioning. This information will feed into an SPD on affordable housing, which will include a calculation for offsite contributions.

- 4.12 JS informed that Blackpool may not be able to use Keppie Massie. DT suggested that Blackpool could produce a document to justify why this case should be treated as an exception (if allowed by Blackpool Council's Constitution as it is in Wyre).
- 4.13 SL asked Fylde if they had any issues with the ORS Study in terms of gypsies and travellers. SL explained that there had been criticisms regarding the ORS methodology in that it underestimates the need and as such, gypsies and travellers are proposing that the 2014 version should be used rather than the 2016 version.
- 4.14 The group discussed the needs for sites for gypsies and travelling showpeople. JS highlighted cases where Gypsies living in bricks and mortar have stated that they have children who in the future may wish to travel. If this is the case, then when they get to that age they can demonstrate their need by travelling. JS informed the group of the considerable pressure at Marton Moss. Tyson Fury is putting a lot of money in to assist homeless travellers. 54 more families are seeking to locate to this area. The Marton Moss Neighbourhood Forum have significant concerns about this issue and do not understand why planning applications can't be refused.
- 4.15 Travellers have bought land on the Moss and then put an application in for the site. A restrictive policy on the Moss means that once unmet need is met then applications can be resisted. It would be more difficult outside the Moss as there would not be that restrictive policy.
- 4.16 ME said that the issue will be assessing the personal needs of the travellers and that the site at Fairfield Road had been a problem. The new site at Weeton will also be a challenge.
[REDACTED]
- 4.17 JS informed the group that ecological studies will be conducted on all the sites and highways advice will be obtained.
- 4.18 Information regarding indoor playing facilities wasn't included in the Part 2 consultation as evidence was still being worked on. Sports England said it needed to be included. JS stated that it would be included at the next stage.
- 4.19 DT asked JS if there had been any progress on the Green Infrastructure evidence. JS informed DT that Public Health are leading on this and was not sure where they were up to. Public Health have been informed that Fylde and Wyre need consulting on this.
- 4.20 DT suggested that all 3 authorities should have a document (SPD) regarding off-site contributions in terms of GI. DT said he thought this should include Land Value. The group agreed.

5 Joint Minerals and Waste Local Plan Update – Fylde Coast Implications

- 5.1 RS provided an update. All DtC parties sent representations to the Joint Minerals and Waste Local Plan consultation.
- 5.2 Meetings with the relevant authorities will be arranged in due course to discuss the issues presented. All presented with different issues and queries.
- 5.3 Issues will hopefully be resolved before moving on to the next stage. It has not yet been decided what the next stage will be however – if there are any major changes there would more than likely be another consultation.

6 Update on Supplementary Planning Documents

Blackpool

- 6.1 JS provided information on Blackpool's SPDs. Clare Johnson is working on a 'Greening Blackpool' SPD. Blackpool has very low tree cover. The SPD will seek to increase tree cover through contributions.
- 6.2 SL informs the group of a trial on Cookson Street where 10 trees have been retrofitted into the design of the street. Advice was given by Myerscough College on which trees would be most suitable for the area. The scheme proved very expensive.
- 6.3 ME informed the group of Fylde Trees and Landscape Strategy.
- 6.4 An Affordable Housing SPD is also underway but are waiting for information from ORS to progress and include the necessary calculations. The information from ORS is also required to see if extra guidance on tenure mixes needs to be provided within the SPD. In terms of the methodology, a matrix toolkit for contributions will be viability tested.
- 6.5 JS informed the group of the intention to produce a Design SPD after the completion of the Greening Blackpool SPD.
- 6.6 JS informed that the Learning and Skills SPD is still an intention. However, this will only apply to large sites. On Council owned sites local skills should be used.

Fylde

- 6.7 JG updated the group. 4 SPDs are underway:

- Biodiversity
 - Healthy Living
 - Affordable Housing and
 - Good Design (The Good Design SPD has been dropped for the moment due to staffing shortages-however, the Scoping Consultation has been completed.)
- 6.8 The Scoping Consultation was carried out between 22 November 2018 and 3 January 2019. The responses were summarised and the Draft Biodiversity, Healthy Living and Affordable Housing documents have been written and were presented to committee on the 27th February where they were approved for consultation. However, they will not be going out for consultation until after the Purdah period. JG informs the group that there is a little work to do on each Draft SPD but they are close to producing a final document.
- 6.9 EG informed the group of updates to the Affordable Housing SPD. The methodology and calculations need finalising. This needs approval from the Housing Team at Fylde Borough Council.
- 6.10 *Action: JS and EG to exchange drafts of SPDs as it will be important to consider each other's work. JS suggested that it should also be read by Susan Parker, from Development Management at Blackpool. JS will provide Susan with EG's details.***
- 6.11 JG updated the group on the Biodiversity SPD. It was initially requested by Natural England. It provides a trigger list for when a survey and assessment are required, suggested content of Ecological Surveys and also sets out the methodology for dealing with ecological issues via the planning application process. The SPD also includes more detail with respect to the mitigation hierarchy and International and European Sites.
- 6.12 SS provided an update on the Healthy Living SPD. The Draft Healthy Living SPD describes issues associated with health and wellbeing in the Borough as well as suggesting ways to bring about improvements. Lancashire County Council's Hot Food Takeaway Advisory Note has been used to inform the Hot Food Takeaway section of the document. It also covers other aspects associated with healthy living, such as community facilities, cycling and walking and access to natural areas. The SPD also acknowledges the potential of Whyndyke Garden Village Healthy New Town in providing an exemplar development in terms of health and wellbeing provision. SS highlighted that discussions are still ongoing with the Whyndyke Garden Village Board regarding Whyndyke Garden Village Healthy New Town is embedded within the document.
- 6.13 EG informed on the status of the Good Design SPD. The approach that has been taken based upon a portfolio of guidance. Specific advice relating to different things such as shop frontages and domestic extensions will branch out from the main section. EG suggested that this may be an appropriate approach for others.
- 6.14 DT added to discussions on Good Design SPDs and informed that Wyre use a master-planning approach for developments of over 50 dwellings which could be fed into an overall

design guidance. Older documents, such as 'Spacing Guidance for New Housing Layouts SPG' could be brought up to date and be amalgamated into a single document.

Wyre

- 6.15 DT updated the group on Wyre's SPDs. LH wishes to organise a meeting between Wyre, Fylde and Blackpool to discuss the scope for joint SPDs.
- 6.16 Wyre are looking into producing an updated Design SPD. DT points to the fact Wyre have an old Design SPD of which some of the principles can be used. It was noted that this could be discussed further in the joint Authority meeting.
- 6.17 Wyre have informal flood risk guidance and are currently looking into producing a Flood Risk SPD, applying the NPPF and NPPG guidance on flood risk and assessment.
- 6.18 DT informed the group of discussions with Fylde and Wyre CCG regarding contributions. It was acknowledged that this concerned Wyre and Fylde and that there is a need to involve Blackpool. It is important to have a joint approach.
- 6.19 DT said that alarm bells rang at the proposition that the relevant authority would collect and hold the money. A discussion between DT and EG highlighted that they both considered it would be best if the CCG held the money and decided how it was spent.

7 Update of Local Plans

Wyre

- 7.1 DT confirmed the adoption of the Wyre Local Plan on the 28th February 2019. The partial review will begin at the beginning of May.
- 7.2 Wyre are currently awaiting clarification from PINS and MHCLG on the housing position statement. There appears to be a slight confusion around the interpretation and Jonathan Easton agrees it is not clear.
- 7.3 Wyre's adopted plan delivers 460 dwellings per annum (dpa). There is a shortfall of 19 dpa in relation to the OAN of 479 dpa.
- 7.4 LCC highway evidence was not detailed enough to justify any cap on specific housing sites. The allocation at Poulton was increased, whilst sites at Inskip were taken out. LCC have found more highway capacity in the A6 corridor. The Partial Review will look at highways evidence alongside the housing number.
- 7.5 ME asked DT if Wyre had considered how they were going to carry out their Partial Review. DT said they were currently unsure but that it would be mainly look at housing and highways.

There is the potential for a new SHMA as a starting point but how it is taken forward is yet to be decided. There are questions as to whether the standard methodology will change again. DT acknowledged that their Local Plan would be up to date until October 2019.

- 7.6 ME informed the group that Fylde have the same issue and need to review in relation to the 2019 framework to keep the Fylde Local Plan up to date.
- 7.7 DT informed the group that Wyre's Local Plan examination cost less than £50,000 and as a result were able to announce a cost saving of £72,000 on the overall Local Plan budget.

Blackpool

- 7.8 Section 4 provides the update on Blackpool's Local Plan situation.
- 7.9 JS updated the group on Marton Moss Neighbourhood Plan. Blackpool Council received no objections to the designation of the Neighbourhood Planning Area and the statutory bodies have given information to the Neighbourhood Forum. The Council are waiting for it to be signed off. When it has been signed off it can be published online despite it being the Purdah period as it isn't a new item and doesn't involve a consultation.
- 7.10 JS highlighted that the neighbourhood group will need to rely on a significant amount of consultant expertise to assist in the production of the neighbourhood plan as experience is limited.
- 7.11 ME highlighted that Fylde have had been similar issues with Wrea Green on a Neighbourhood Planning front.
- 7.12 There have been also been some difficulties gaining representatives from the gypsy and traveller communities within the neighbourhood forum. JS highlighted how it would be sensible to use the neighbourhood plan to allocate a travellers site (despite significant objections) so that they have a say in its location.
- 7.13 JG asked if SS could attend the Marton Moss consultation.
- 7.14 Action: JS to add SS to consultation database.**

Fylde

- 7.15 ME informed the group that the Fylde Local Plan is working well. 10 out of 10 appeals have been won as a result of having the Local Plan in place. The co-joined appeal for four large sites at Wrea Green was highly significant.

- 7.16 The Fylde Local Plan is up to date to October so Fylde are currently trying to establish a sound process for the partial review.
- 7.17 JS queried how we are going to deal with longer term needs for the Fylde Coast. In response, ME announced the potential for a member level meeting, which will be discussed further in AOB.
- 7.18 ME stated that it would be beneficial in the relevant Local Plan review to align housing numbers. ME suggests allowing leniency in using the standard methodology number (increasing it slightly) so if it changes then the plan wouldn't automatically be out of date.
- 7.19 JS raised concerns about Blackpool's figure, which ranges from 93 to 115. There have been significant net losses over the past years because of Queen's Park. JS informed the group that Blackpool have been in contact with CLG but have received no reply.
- 7.20 ME asked DT if Wyre have any aspirations for a higher than standard methodology number. DT informed that they had no intentions of doing this. ME said that Fylde's approach would probably take their standard methodology number of 296 plus leeway, for economic growth.
- 7.21 JS highlighted concerns over what is going on at the Economic Board and LEP. For example, what are their economic aspirations and how does this connect with housing? There appears to be a disconnect. JS enquired as to whether information from the LEP is cascaded to chief planning officers. ME informed the group that Steve Smith's post has been filled which will provide an opportunity to get more involved with the LEP.
- 7.22 JS enquired as to what a review of the Local Plan will mean for the Plan period. ME informed that the Plan period will stay the same and that the review will just update in regards to the 2019 NPPF.

8 AOB

- 8.1 JS asked the group what database they used. ME said that Fylde use DP Online, which is part of the Acolaid System but people cannot comment on line via this mechanism. The importance of adhering to GDPR regulations was highlighted. The Plans and Regulatory Services online was mentioned as a useful document to help ensure GDPR compliance.
- 8.2 DT asked JS if Blackpool will be making representations regarding the A585 Norcross scheme.
- 8.3 **Action: JS to ask Jeremy Walker and let DT know.**

- 8.4 ME asked if anyone was applying for the Future High Street Fund. Blackpool are putting in a bid for Blackpool Town Centre and Wyre are putting in a bid for Fleetwood. Fylde are submitting a bid for Kirkham. It is expected that 300+ submissions will be received, and 50-100 could be taken on.
- 8.5 JS spoke to ME about her concerns over the application at Morrisons and how there may be strong conflict of interests involved.
- 8.6 ***Action: JS to discuss further with ME***
- 8.7 ME proposed a member level meeting to the group in order to determine how best to deal with longer term needs for the Fylde Coast and to ascertain the appetite for a Joint Plan. The last meeting was in June 2016. JS noted the importance of a joint evidence base if the Joint Fylde Coast Plan was to go ahead.
- 8.8 The next steps would involve discussions surrounding combined research and financing, highways, joint housing, economic aspects and the Economic Partnership Board and planning.
- 8.9 RS suggested that with enough notice of the intention to produce a joint Fylde Coast Plan, LCC may be able to timetable LTP/Masterplan work to run in sync with the joint plan programme.

9 Date of next meeting

- 9.1 June (date to be confirmed) - Wyre to host

Appendix 2

Minutes of Fylde Coast Duty to Cooperate Officers' Meeting 17th July 2019

Duty to Cooperate (DtC)

Fylde Coast Authorities and Lancashire County Council

Wednesday 17 July 2019, 14.00-16.00pm

Held at Wyre Council, Civic Centre, Committee Room 2

Minutes

Attendance

Julie Glaister (JG) (Fylde)

Eddie Graves (EG) (Fylde)

Len Harris (LH) (Wyre)

Steve Lamb (SL) (Blackpool)

Réa Psillidou (RP) (Wyre)

Jane Saleh (JS) Blackpool

Richard Sharples (RS) (LCC)

1. Apologies

Mark Evans and David Thow sent apologies.

2. Minutes of the last meeting

RP noted that at para. 8.2 “Normoss” should read “Norcross”.

Agreed subject to the amendment referred to above and all to confirm amendments made to the draft minutes are acceptable.

Action – all to send e-mail to EG confirming that the minutes of the last meeting are agreed or to identify any further amendments required.

3. Matters arising

RP noted that works are due to take place at the Norcross roundabout in late July and that there may be implications – particularly in terms of road closures and diversions - for traffic flow in Blackpool. JS noted and will investigate.

4. Local planning update

Blackpool Local Plan 2012-2027 Part 2

JS reported that 74 representations were received to the recent consultation of which 35 related to the proposed travellers site at Faraday Way. Other notable representations were Sport England (strategy/evidence base required for indoor sports provision), English Heritage and retail consultants regarding locally set thresholds. Blackpool are working on their responses with a view to stakeholder workshops taking place in September prior to publishing a Publication version of the document over Christmas 2019. JS also reported that:

- Housing allocations are being updated and will include a site at Ryscar Way which has outline planning permission and is located close to the Wyre boundary.
- The consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal has not raised any significant issues and will be updated to reflect revised policies.
- Lambert Smith Hampton has been appointed to undertake the viability assessment for the Plan.

In the discussion that followed it was noted that Blackpool will need to produce a DTC statement which needs to identify the dialogue undertaken with key stakeholders. There was also a discussion about the nature of Pt2 policies – the extent to which some may be regarded as being strategic - in the context of Blackpool having a Core Strategy.

Marton Moss Neighbourhood Plan

JS reported that there is a designated forum and neighbourhood plan area. Blackpool council are the responsible body. The Forum has appointed Envision to progress the neighbourhood plan.

Annual Position Statement Submission (Wyre and Fylde)

Fylde

JG/EG reported that 12 representations were received on the Draft APS about half of which made substantive comments including those made on behalf of Gladman and Wainhomes which raised the issue of the legitimacy of producing an APS in the light of government guidance. Fylde hoping to submit the final APS to PINs in advance of the 31 July deadline.

Wyre

RP reported that 11 representations were received on the Draft APS the majority of which made substantive comments (including similar points about the legitimacy of producing an APS) and included a significant number of comments on individual sites from developers seeking to reduce the five year supply. One issue that has arisen is that relating to

permanently occupied mobile homes where no planning permission, but council tax is being paid. Wyre has included a figure in the draft APS completions figure to account for supply from this source, although this has attracted some criticism from some respondents.

Fylde Local Plan Partial Review

Regulation 18 consultation completed 6 June 2019. 37 responses received. Currently considering NPPF compliance and any implications for the Plan. Also updating evidence on housing need.

Wyre Local Plan Partial Review

Currently engaged in publishing the APS and developing several masterplans (with developers/landowners) to bring forward key local plan allocations for residential and mixed use development. Will be moving forward with the Partial Review including reviewing and updating housing needs. Recognise that need to discuss housing needs with neighbouring authorities. Aiming to review/update the SCI and LDS with approval by the end of September 2019. Work on NPPF compliance being undertaken.

JS – issue of how the Plan will link to job growth given the EZ at Hillhouse. Question of whether or not members would support the minimum housing requirement arising from the standard method or seek an uplift.

Joint Minerals and Waste Local Plan Update – Fylde Coast Implications

RS reported that LCC will be consulting on a revised Reg 19 Plan, together with a response to representations on the initial Reg. 19 document, autumn/winter 2019 with submission in 2020. Currently updating local aggregate and waste assessments. Latest version will include Waste Infrastructure Safeguarding Areas – 250m buffer around operational waste sites. Noted national issue of LAs permitting housing in locations too close to waste sites. To inform the document LCC will be meeting individual local authorities to inform the final document.

JG/EG noted that Fylde councillors will want to see how comments made by Fylde have been taken into account.

RS – note that the future agenda item should delete the reference to “Fylde Coast Implications”.

Action - RS to e-mail Fylde council when the revised Reg. 19 becomes available in the public domain.

Action – note point on title of agenda item for future reference.

Additional item:

Lancashire Plan

RS reported that the Lancashire Plan is at the start of the production process. The meeting expressed the importance of engaging with planners, particularly noting that the infrastructure needed to deliver growth will need to pass through the planning system. It is understood that a presentation introducing the Lancashire Plan has been made available in each authority.

Action – add Lancashire Plan to future agendas.

5. Joint working opportunities and arrangements

Local Plan Evidence base

Acknowledgement that there is a need to focus initial efforts on partial reviews (Fylde and Wyre) and Blackpool Pt 2 Local Plan but that working towards main reviews of the respective local plans will be an emerging priority in the next 18 months with the potential for joint working on a joint strategic document, the scope of which will require agreement. Issue of level of housing development that members will agree to was recognised. There will be a need to update evidence base documents including those relating to Gypsy and Traveller provision, employment, housing demand/need and transport. Recognised that Wyre and Fylde will need to focus on their initial reviews first but that thinking needs to be done over the next 18 months on the scope of joint working/joint local plan production for the main reviews.

Action – JS to progress a scoping paper over the next 18 months or so.

Supplementary Planning Documents

Blackpool – affordable housing SPD – Lambert Smith Hampton providing advice on off-site contributions. ORS are updating affordable housing need data. JS indicated that Blackpool are happy to share the methodology. SPD will be subject to consultation. Greening Blackpool - includes GI developer contributions. JS to share in confidence. Car parking standards – LCC and Wyre – no concerns. Fylde will respond as there are some development management concerns.

Wyre – working on guidance relating to GI and will need to update existing guidance for applicants on the flood risk sequential test. Environmental Protection colleagues are working on guidance on air quality (based on Lancaster templates) and SuDS. Air quality will be adopted as an SPD.

Fylde - Consultation on Biodiversity and Health Living SPDs ends 8 August.

Action – JS – share Greening Blackpool draft SPD

Action – JS – share methodology relating to affordable housing

6. Travellers

No significant comment.

7. LTP4

Concern expressed around the table that the current timetable of LTP4 production next year doesn't dovetail with local plan timescales and the need to deliver transport infrastructure to support development. Michelle Holroyd is LTP lead.

RS – LTP4 will be an update of the existing document. Noted that not possible to align production timeframes with local plans and that implementation will be by masterplans.

RP – noted that the last masterplan did not take into account emerging plans and that any new editions need to feed into local plan reviews. Noted that there are major highway infrastructure issues on the Fylde coast and given the long lead-in period for delivery, early discussion is needed.

RS – main focus should be on local authority main reviews instead of the planned for partial reviews (Wyre and Fylde).

Key issue identified by the meeting is the need for strategic infrastructure planning to be explicitly built into the LTP process.

EG – need to formalise LTP involvement in the DTC meeting.

Action – invite Michelle Holroyd to future meetings of this group.

8. AOB

Accessible documents

Action – JS to send link to guidelines.

Climate change emergency

Blackpool and Wyre members have independently declared a climate change emergency. Fylde have not. Issue of implications for planning will need to be assessed.

9. Date of next meeting

Blackpool will host the next meeting. Date to be confirmed.

Appendix 3

Minutes of Fylde Coast Duty to Cooperate Officers' Meeting 1st November 2019

Duty to Cooperate (DtC)

Fylde Coast Authorities and Lancashire County Council

Friday 01 November 2019

10.00 am

Blackpool Council

Bickerstaffe House, Blackpool

MINUTES

Attendees:

Fylde Council: Mark Evans (ME), Julie Glaister (JG), Eddie Graves (EG)

Blackpool Council: Jane Saleh (JS), Stephen Lamb (SL) Jeremy Walker (JW)

Wyre Council: David Thow (DT), Rea Psillidou (RP)

Lancashire County Council: Michelle Holroyd (MH), Dave Colbert (DC)

1 Introductions and Apologies

1.1 Apologies received from Len Harris (LH) and Richard Sharples (RS)

2 Minutes of the last meeting(s)

2.1 Minutes of the 12th March meeting were agreed.

2.2 RP noted that the final submission Annual Position Statement (APS) did not include a figure for mobile homes, as suggested in the minutes of the 17th July meeting.

2.3 Subject to the amendment referred to above, the minutes of the 17th July meeting were agreed.

3 Matters arising

3.1 RP reported that Wyre had received an email from the Planning Inspectorate informing them that the Wyre APS had not been assessed. DT highlighted that the lack of an APS assessment could have implications for an Inquiry Wyre have in January 2019.

4 Update on the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4)

4.1 DC gave a PowerPoint presentation on LTP4. He stated that a lot of work on LTP4 was underway and that they wanted to share this with the districts. He highlighted that the

situation was in a state of flux and that there was currently little clarity from the Government, with the election providing further uncertainty.

- 4.2 He noted that in 2010 the balance was in favour of economic growth, but that now climate change had risen up the agenda. He emphasised that LTPs are still statutory and that in Greater Manchester the LTP is now tied to the Spatial Framework.
- 4.3 DC stated that a huge amount had changed since the publication of LTP3. LTP4 was going to be a Joint LTP and the intention was that there would be 3 separate implementation plans covering Lancashire, Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool. LTP4 would now need to take account of Transport for the North's Strategic Transport Plan, as well as Lancashire's Strategic Economic Plan and the proposed Lancashire Industrial Strategy. Five masterplan areas were identified for Lancashire under LTP3, including one for the Fylde Coast.
- 4.4 DC highlighted some key challenges in the following areas
- Economic – employment and productivity
 - Environmental – climate change, flood risk and air quality
 - Social – deprivation, health and wellbeing
 - Transport – connectivity, congestion and accessibility
 - Assets – highway condition and public realm
- 4.5 DC provided information on Government designated Major Road Networks (MRN), which are eligible for MRN funding. Discussion took place about highways on the Fylde Coast, including the A585 and A6. DC stated that the status of the A585 as a trunk road related to the port at Fleetwood, but that there was no rationale for this now. There would be significant costs for LCC if it was detrunked, but if it was designated as part of the MRN it would be eligible for MRN funding. The A6 didn't meet the qualifying criteria for MRN designation because the traffic flow wasn't high enough. JW confirmed that Preston New Road and Squires Gate Lane had been designated part of the MRN. It was also highlighted that the Preston Western Distributor will have significant implications for highways on the Fylde Coast in the future.
- 4.6 In terms of rail, DC stated that LCC are expecting HS2 to be delivered in full, with a connection to the west coast mainline south of Wigan. He noted that the current Government is interested in buses, but that freight, logistics and servicing are often overlooked in policy documents.
- 4.7 DC highlighted the importance of strategic transport corridors including the East – West Trans-Pennine route, which goes from Blackpool to the East Coast (M65 Corridor). He stated that the South Fylde line is better considered on a Preston – Blackpool/Fylde Coast basis, because it can get lost in the wider analysis. He also highlighted the importance of links between Lancashire and the Manchester region and onwards to Yorkshire, with Sheffield noted as an important location for advanced manufacturing.

- 4.8 Preston is bidding for Transforming Cities funding and is expected to submit at the end of November. Cycling initiatives form a major part of the Preston bid. The East Lancashire authorities are also looking at this funding for the future.
- 4.9 A key issue is how people will travel in the future, as transport evolves and movement habits change. DC cited the example of Park and Ride, which could have a limited future if people don't work and shop in central locations. He also noted that the availability and affordability of public transport is often out of Lancashire County Council's control. Public health is now also firmly on the LTP agenda.
- 4.10 In terms of climate change, MH stated that Lancashire County Council had not declared a climate change emergency. DC highlighted that there was potential for decarbonisation to take place sooner in terms of transportation than in other areas, such as heating homes.
- 4.11 In terms of cycling, DC highlighted the importance of maintaining cycle networks once they have been created and that they need to be seen as equal to other highway networks. Local cycling and walking infrastructure plans are being produced and it is hoped that one can be produced for the Fylde Coast. Discussion took place about the impact of providing capacity for cycle storage on trains.
- 4.12 DC provided information about the timeline for LTP4, which can now take account of Transport for the North's published Strategic Transport Plan. LCC would like to publish by summer 2020, but the climate change agenda is starting to have more of an influence. LTP4 cannot be published if the Pan Lancashire Climate Change Action Plan hasn't been produced. LTP4 could be challenged if climate change isn't satisfactorily taken into account.
- 4.13 Discussion took place about the conflict between climate change and road use. DC stated that there will always be some locations where a road intervention is the only solution. The potential impact of an increase in electric vehicles and autonomous vehicles also needs consideration. From an economic development perspective new roads can open up areas for development, but may conflict with the climate change agenda.
- 4.14 Final publication of LTP4 is likely to be after the comprehensive spending review. DC is happy to come back at a later date to keep the Fylde Coast authorities up to date in terms of progress. The aim is to get LTP4 adopted by the end of 2020, but this could be affected by any changes that emerge after the General Election. There will be a 3 month consultation next summer and the Fylde Coast authorities will be stakeholders. It was noted that there is currently very little clarity about a Greater Lancashire Strategic Plan.
- 4.15 In terms of reviewing transport masterplans DC stated that the current priority is Central Lancashire, where most development is currently being delivered. There is also a push to give the A585 greater priority, with the designation of MRNs potentially offering greater scope for this.

5. Update on LEP

- 5.1 No update. Kathryn Malloy has left the LEP. Martine Winder was suggested as a LEP contact.

6. Duty to Cooperate Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)

- 6.1 General discussion took place about joint working on the Fylde Coast. DC stated that future transport funding is likely to be tied into specific outcomes, such as housing delivery.
- 6.2 JS raised the issue of dealing with housing in the future on the Fylde Coast and whether a piece of work on this should be commissioned. DT highlighted that Wyre's current focus was the partial review, which was due to be submitted by 2022 and that they wouldn't want to commission new evidence until this work was completed. Fylde were also working on their review. JS stated that as the Core Strategy was adopted in 2016 there was a need to review Blackpool policies by 2021.
- 6.3 It was suggested that that authority plan timescales could potentially be aligned in the future, but after the current reviews had taken place. JS stated that one option would be for Blackpool to extend their plan until 2032 and then potentially work jointly with the other authorities.
- 6.4 Central Lancashire coordinate their joint work through a joint advisory committee, but there would need to be a political will to do this. ME suggested that the political will and options would need to be explored. Central Lancashire have worked on the basis of a joint Core Strategy and individual allocation documents
- 6.5 Discussion then took place about SoCG, which have different requirements to Statements of Compliance. JS stated that Blackpool would appreciate comments on an initial draft Duty to Cooperate Statement of Common Ground relating to the Blackpool Local Plan Part 2. The majority of strategic matters were dealt with in the Statement of Compliance for the Blackpool Core Strategy. JS highlighted that the other authorities would get letters as part of the Publication consultation.
- 6.6 EG highlighted that SoCG would be needed for the Local Plan partial reviews being undertaken by Wyre and Fylde.
- 6.7 Discussion took place about Memorandums of Understanding and their relationship with Statements of Common Ground. EG stated that the Memorandum of Understanding sets out how the three authorities will engage with each other and that the SoCG sets out the relative position of the authorities. ME stated that both are required as the Memorandum of Understanding puts a structure in place for members.
- 6.8 Discussion took place about strategic matters. EG had produced a draft structure for a SoCG, but this was restricted to the matters that were covered by the partial review. This contrasted with the draft Blackpool SoCG which related to the Blackpool Local Plan Part 2. EG stated that happy in principle to send out draft SoCG for comments.

7. Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents Update and Progress

Blackpool

- 7.1 JS provided an update. The Local Plan Part 2 was anticipated to go to Full Council in November, but this has been cancelled due to the General Election. It is now anticipated that it will go to Full Council in February, with consultation to take place after this.
- 7.2 The Local Plan Viability consultants (Lambert Smith Hampton) have provided some early feedback. Despite housing completions going up in recent years, viability has become more challenging. Some policies may have to be reworded to reflect this, which will also necessitate further sustainability appraisal. JS will produce a paper for members. JS highlighted that there has been limited interest from housebuilders in the process.
- 7.3 In terms of other documents JS stated that the Playing Pitch Strategy is being updated, a Greening Blackpool SPD has been drafted, but has not yet gone out for consultation and that Lambert Smith Hampton are providing advice in terms of the proposed Draft Affordable Housing SPD. EG stated that he would send Blackpool a copy of Fylde's Draft Affordable Housing SPD.

Action: EG to provide Blackpool with a copy of the Fylde Affordable Housing SPD.

Wyre

- 7.4 RP provided an update. Work was taking place on masterplans for site allocations. All allocations over 50 dwellings were subject to this requirement. RP highlighted that new guidance from the Government supported this approach. A Freedom of Information request was submitted to PINs regarding the Wyre APS (in relation to an Inquiry at Lambs Road) and PINs released the APS. RP highlighted that the APS was a huge amount of work.
- 7.5 RP stated that the Economic Development Team was down to 1 person and that Fiona had been seconded to this team. The Local Plan review had been delayed. The review was focussed on whether there should be an uplift from the standard methodology housing figure and implications in terms of highways evidence. The new manager was starting in January.

Fylde

- 7.6 JG stated that Fylde were working on the partial review and that a scoping consultation took place at the beginning of summer. A Local Development Scheme was due to go to Planning Committee in November. SPDs on healthy living and biodiversity had been adopted.

Minerals and Waste

7.7 No update. RP stated that it was understood from the last meeting that RS would be contacting authorities to arrange meetings to discuss any issues. DC said that he would speak to RS.

Action: DC to speak to RS re contacting authorities.

8. AOB

8.1 None

9. Date of next meeting

9.1 County to host. February 2020 suggested (date to be confirmed)

Action: County to confirm date and venue for next meeting

Appendix 4

Minutes of Fylde Coast Duty to Cooperate Officers' Meeting 10th February 2020

Duty to Cooperate (DtC)

Fylde Coast Authorities and Lancashire County Council

10 February 2020

10.00 am

Lancashire County Council County Hall, Preston

MINUTES

Attendees:

Fylde Council: Eddie Graves (EG)

Blackpool Council: Helen Del Piano (HDP)

Wyre Council: David Thow (DT), Steve Smith (SS), Len Harris (LH)

Lancashire County Council: Richard Sharples (RS)

1 Introductions and Apologies

1.1 Apologies received from Jane Salah, Julie Glaister

2 Minutes of the last meeting(s)

2.1 Minutes of the 1 November meeting were provisionally agreed, subject to checking correct version had been circulated. (Subsequently checked and confirmed).

3 Matters arising

3.1 Action at 7.3 – EG has not, but will circulate Affordable Housing SPD to Blackpool. Action at 7.7 RS stated DC had not mentioned this, but RS confirmed LCC would be making contact with districts to arrange duty to cooperate discussions.

4. Update on LEP

4.1 No update.

5. Duty to Cooperate Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)

Fylde

5.1 RS asked why the statement only covered the Fylde administrative area, rather than the wider Fylde coast housing market area or similar given the strategic issues are cross boundary. EG

replied that the document was originally drafted to be overarching, but that it has become a Fylde document relating specifically to the Local Plan review, which has a very restricted remit. SS stated that each authority was at a different stage in the plan making process, albeit often only weeks apart.

- 5.2 The relationship between the emerging SOCGs and the memorandum of understanding for the Fylde Coast working group was discussed. The memorandum of understanding has not been updated yet. It was agreed that when it is it should relate just to governance arrangements for the Fylde Coast Duty to Cooperate working group, with strategic matters removed and addressed in the SOCGs.
- 5.3 HDP stated that Blackpool would feedback separately to EG if they had any issues with the current draft version of the Fylde SoCG.
- 5.4 SS stated that Wyre felt the Wyre Local Plan established that there is unmet need for housing in the Fylde coast area, and so the Fylde SOCG needed a statement to that effect. Given this unmet need Wyre also do not support para 1.6, 5.12, 6.5, 6.9, 6.10-6.13, and 7.6.
- 5.5 EG requested that Wyre's concerns be set out in an email in confirmation of the matters discussed here. SS agreed to provide this. SS and EG agreed to discuss any redrafting relating to these comments outside of the working group.

Blackpool

- 5.6 SS stated Wyre had an issue with statements in Blackpool's SOCG at para 4.8 and 8.2 that don't sufficiently reflect the position on unmet need in the Fylde coast established by the Wyre Local Plan. SS stated there is also an issue around the minor amendment to the greenbelt land designation close to the Blackpool/Wyre boundary that is not addressed in the SOCG.
- 5.7 RS suggested that as the preparation of planning policy for minerals and waste planning, and strategic transport planning, are undertaken jointly by Blackpool and Lancashire councils, and the SOCG could benefit from including reference to that.

6. Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents Update and Progress

Blackpool

- 6.1 HDP updated. Drafting publication version, with view to consult late May. Currently being viability tested (using Lambert Smith Hampton). The Sustainability appraisal would then be undertaken by Arcadis. There remains an outstanding issue with the Playing Pitch Strategy. Sport England have raised concerns regarding future under provision arising from some allocations. SS stated there are some pitches, in the Enterprise Zone, that are in Fylde but count towards Blackpool's provision. LH asked if they had had received comments requesting a policy from Sport England for commuted sums for the provision of indoor sports provision. HDP stated that Sport England had not asked for such a policy, but the evidence base suggests there is no need for built sports facilities in Blackpool, and viability would rule out such a policy.

Fylde

- 6.2 EG updated. Members have seen updated documents in mid-January. Anticipating going to committee for approval to consult on next stage in March. SS stated that he is not sure from Wyre's perspective that housing policy changes are sufficient. EG stated that without Wyre's plan advancing they cannot add more detail.

Wyre

- 6.3 SS updated. Essentially same as Fylde but a couple of months behind. Scoping consultation on partial review to start 28 February. Taking account of the standard methodology the ambition is that they should be able to meet all housing need, and as the numbers have dropped there may not be a need to address the highways evidence.

Minerals and Waste

- 6.4 RS updated. Next stage will be discussions with districts/neighbours to attempt to resolve issues raised in previous consultation. Progress after that will potentially depend on the anticipated publication of a revised national waste strategy and revised national planning policy for waste, both expected early to mid 2020.

7. AOB

- 7.1 EG stated Fylde's annual position statement was found by an Inspector to need changes to the housing requirement, resulting in it being published showing a shortfall in the 5 year land supply, rather than the Fylde position that there is a sufficient supply. Fylde have made the decision to legally challenge the Inspector's decision. SS stated Wyre have published their annual position statement.

8. Date of next meeting

- 8.1 Fylde to host. May 2020 suggested (date to be confirmed)

Action: Fylde to confirm date and venue for next meeting

