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1. Introduction

It is a legal requirement of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) 2012 Regulations (SI No.767) that a Statement of Consultation accompanies the submission of the local plan to the Secretary of State. Regulation 22 of the regulations requires the Statement to set out:

1. Who was consulted during the local plan preparation stages (known as the Regulation 18 stage/s) – for the Wyre Local Plan this was the publication of the Issues and Options document of 2015;
2. How those who were consulted were invited to make representations;
3. What main issues were raised by the consultees;
4. How the representations were taken into account in local plan preparation;
5. The number of representations made in response to the Publication Draft version of the local plan (Regulation 20 stage); and
6. A summary of the main issues raised in response to the Publication Draft Local Plan.

Regulation 22 also requires the council to publish the responses received at the Regulation 20 stage and any relevant supporting documents.

This version of the Statement of Consultation (January 2018) has been produced to support the Submission of the Draft Wyre Local Plan 2018 (Regulation 22). It amends the version produced for the Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 published in September 2017 by providing additional information to comply with items (5) and (6) above. Therefore in line with the Regulations outlined above, the Submission Statement of Consultation details the nature and outcomes of the consultation and engagement carried out at the plan preparation stage (Regulation 18) and Publication Local Plan stage (Regulation 19).

Regulation 18 requires consultation at the plan preparation stage, however there is nothing in the regulations themselves that prescribe the form such preparations should take. It is common that local planning authorities will publish under Regulation 18 topic or issues papers that describe the key economic, environmental and social context and set out the main planning issues arising. For the Wyre Local Plan this stage of the plan preparation process was represented by the publication of the Issues and Options document of June 2015 (and accompanying Interim Sustainability Appraisal).

The Issues and Options document identified in map form potential site allocations. These potential allocations were informed by two separate Call for Sites (CfS) exercises held in 2012 and 2014. A third exercise was carried out in 2015 specifically to identify land suitable to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople. Given the importance of matters concerning objectively assessed need and site allocations to the production of the Wyre
Local Plan, this statement will also concern itself with the approach the council took to the three CfS exercises.

Regulation 19 requires the publication for public comment the version of the Plan that the council intend to submit for examination under Regulation 22. Regulation 19 requires that before submitting a local plan to the Secretary of State the council local planning authority must:

(a) make a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available in accordance with regulation 35, and

(b) ensure that a statement of the representations procedure and a statement of the fact that the proposed submission documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected, is sent to each of the general consultation bodies and each of the specific consultation bodies invited to make representations under regulation 18(1).

Accordingly, this version of the Statement of Consultation details the consultation process associated with the Publication (Regulation 19) stage and the outcomes.

Wyre borough contains 18 parish councils and three town councils. Engagement with the parish and town councils continues to be an important part of the plan preparation process and is also described below.

To provide the necessary context, the next two sections of this Statement detail the background to the new Wyre Local Plan and show how the authority has met its obligations under its own Statement of Community Involvement.

2. Developing the Wyre Local Plan

The Wyre Local Plan will be a single document consisting of a written statement and policies map. It will include the following:

- Spatial Portrait and key issues;
- Vision and objectives;
- Strategic policies;
- Core development management policies
- Housing policies
- Economy policies; and
- Land allocations and designations.

The plan will cover a 20 year period from 2011 to 2031. Once adopted it will replace the following currently adopted development plans:
Wyre Local Plan (1999), saved policies 2007
The Fleetwood Thornton Area Action Plan (2009)

On adoption of the new Wyre Local Plan, the statutory development plan for Wyre will comprise:

- The Wyre Local Plan 2011-2031

The council has previously published for public comment a Core Strategy Preferred Options document dated March 2012. The Core Strategy was to establish the strategic direction for the Local Plan and include area specific and core policies. The Core Strategy Preferred Options document, along with the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan, underwent a period of public consultation between 2nd April and 21st May 2012. However, as a consequence of the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 and the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) in March 2014, and the updating of key evidence base documents, at a meeting of the Full Council on 10th April 2014 the Council decided to prepare a single Local Plan. This new arrangement was published through a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) (April 2014) made available on the council’s web site.

Subsequently, the Full Council approved a revised 2016 LDS on 7th July 2016. This later edition included an updated timetable to address delays in the plan making process brought about by on-going evidence base development relating to two key strategic issues, namely:

- Highway capacity; and
- Flood risk.

3. Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

The Wyre Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) sets out how the council intends to involve all sections of the community in the planning process. The original SCI was adopted in May 2007. It was prepared in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (“2004 Act”) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. Since that time there have been a number of changes to the legislation and regulations.

In 2010 the SCI was revised to reflect changes in national planning guidance and the experience gained from previous consultation exercises at that time. The revised SCI notes in its introduction that the changes it takes account of are the amendments made to the 2004 Regulations in 2008 and 2009. The 2008 and 2009 changes are outlined in paragraphs...
1.4 to 1.8 of the 2010 document and are reflected throughout the revised SCI. Since the publication of the revised SCI in 2010 there have been further changes in legislation. In 2011 the Localism Act 2011 made a number of amendments to the amended 2004 Act. For example, the Localism Act 2011 introduced the duty to cooperate when preparing plans.


Since 2010 not only has the legislative landscape changed, but the council has decided to publish a single local plan. However the core aims enshrined in the SCI remain valid. These are to give the community:

- Access to information.
- The opportunity to contribute ideas.
- The opportunity to take an active part in developing proposals and options.
- The opportunity to be consulted and make representations on formal proposals.
- The opportunity to be informed about progress and outcomes.

Against this background, the SCI sets establishes a set of minimum consultation standards, which requires that at each stage the following applies:

1. The consultation period will last six weeks;

2. All consultation documents will be made available for inspection at:
   a) Wyre Borough Council Offices.
   b) Wyre Borough Council’s website.
   c) All public libraries

3. Supporting evidence will be made available electronically on the website and hard copies will be made available on request at Wyre Borough Council Offices and at all public libraries.

4. Adverts (notices) will be placed in the local press, on the Council's web site, at Wyre council offices and public libraries. These will advise where and when the document can be inspected, how copies can be obtained, what the closing date is for representation, where to send representations, and where to get further information.

5. All consultees identified in the Local Development Framework consultation database will be invited to comment on particular Local Plan Documents.
6. All members of the community who express an interest during the process will continue to be kept informed of the progress, including details of future consultations.

The SCI sets out broad engagement and consultation methods for local plan production. Although the stages of preparation have changed as a result of changes in legislation and guidance, and the move to a single local plan, the approach of the council accords with the general approach set out in the SCI. In particular it is noted that the Issues and Options (Regulation 18 stage) involved extensive engagement and consultation as set out below and that the local plan process has been informed by on-going engagement with parish and town council’s as community representatives.

In summary, it is the view of the council that its overall approach to engagement and consultation and the specific activities so carried out are in accord with the SCI.

4. Ward, Parish and Town Council Member Involvement

**Wyre Ward Councillors**

Wyre council contains 24 wards served by a total of 50 ward councillors. Of these seven, including the Leader of the Council, sit on the council’s Cabinet. As well as the formal reporting of local plan matters to Cabinet and Full Council, including briefings for the relevant portfolio holder, engagement with members has taken place through the Planning Policy Working Group (PPWG), an advisory body (the Group is not a formal Committee or Sub-Committee of the Council) comprising of between 10 and 16 Councillors, including:

- Representatives from each geographic area of the Borough (i.e. Fleetwood, Thornton-Cleveleys, Poulton-le-Fylde, Rural East and Rural West);
- Two members of the Planning Committee.
- The relevant Portfolio Holder.
- Two opposition Members.

The PPWG meets on an as-needed basis and is chaired by a senior member, currently the chair of the Planning Committee.

**Wyre Parish and Town Councillors**

The borough of Wyre contains 18 parish councils and three town councils. In total they are served by 151 councillors. The only parts of the borough without parish or town council administration are Cleveleys, Thornton and Poulton-le-Fylde.

Engagement with the parish and town councils has been, and continues to be, an integral part of the local plan engagement process. This engagement takes part in several ways.
Firstly, in 2010 a system of Planning Ambassadors was created to provide a link between the council’s planning function (development management, planning policy and regeneration) and the parish/town councils. Under the Planning Ambassador system, each parish/town council is invited to nominate a parish or town councillor as their Planning Ambassador. The role of the Planning Ambassador is to:

- Act as a conduit between the council and parish/town council, acting as an initial contact point for matters where a parish or town council input is required into a planning matter;
- Provide a means by which information can be shared with the full parish/town council; and
- Provide a route through which matters can be raised by the parish/town council with the planning department.

Secondly, officers from the policy team have met individually with each parish/town council at key stages as follows:

September to November 2014 – a series of informal meetings were held between the Chief Executive and/or Head of Planning, officers from the planning policy team and the relevant Planning Ambassador plus other parish/town council members to discuss the emerging evidence base (particularly that pertaining to housing) and key emerging issues both locally and across the borough. Meetings were held with all but two parish councils, neither of whom accepted the relevant invitation. Most meetings took place at a venue in the relevant parish/town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish/Town Council</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnacre-with-Bonds</td>
<td>1/10/14</td>
<td>Garstang (Bonds), Bowgreave and Calder Vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleasdale</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabus</td>
<td>29/9/14</td>
<td>Cabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garstang (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catterall</td>
<td>8/9/14</td>
<td>Catterall (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claughton</td>
<td>8/9/14</td>
<td>Catterall (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>6/10/14</td>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forton</td>
<td>3/10/14</td>
<td>Forton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hollins Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garstang</td>
<td>16/9/14</td>
<td>Garstang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Eccleston</td>
<td>14/11/14</td>
<td>Great Eccleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hambleton</td>
<td>7/10/14</td>
<td>Hambleton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September to November 2016 - as with the 2014 engagement, a series of meetings were held with Planning Ambassadors plus other parish/town council representatives to highlight key issues emerging from the on-going evidence base development and from the 2015 Issues and Options consultation. At these meetings officers identified potential allocations and discussed draft policies, although as this was work in progress such information was shared on a confidential basis. Meetings were held with all parish/town councils. Most meetings took place at a venue in the relevant parish/town and as with the 2014 meetings were attended by Chief Executive and/or Head of Planning and officers from the planning policy team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish/Town Council</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inskip</td>
<td>29/10/14</td>
<td>Inskip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>15/10/14</td>
<td>Churchtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myerscough and Bilsborrow</td>
<td>25/9/14</td>
<td>Barton Bilsborrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nateby</td>
<td>14/10/14</td>
<td>Nateby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether Wyresdale</td>
<td>14/10/14</td>
<td>Scorton Dolphinholme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out Rawcliffe</td>
<td>8/10/14</td>
<td>Out Rawcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilling</td>
<td>29/9/14</td>
<td>Pilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preesall</td>
<td>20/10/14</td>
<td>Knott End/Preesall Preesall Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalmine with Staynall</td>
<td>8/10/14</td>
<td>Stalmine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Rawcliffe with Tarnacre</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>St Michaels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winmarleigh</td>
<td>14/10/14</td>
<td>Winmarleigh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish/Town Council</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnacre-with-Bonds</td>
<td>17/11/16</td>
<td>Bowgreave, Garstang (Bonds), Calder Vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleasdale</td>
<td>29/9/16</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabus</td>
<td>19/9/16</td>
<td>Cabus Garstang (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catterall</td>
<td>5/9/16</td>
<td>Catterall (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauhtgon</td>
<td>5/9/16</td>
<td>Catterall (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>7/9/16</td>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forton</td>
<td>16/9/16</td>
<td>Forton and Hollins Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garstang</td>
<td>23/9/16</td>
<td>Garstang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further meetings have taken place in 2017 where emerging proposals warranted a further briefing. These were as follows:

### 5. Local Plan Preparation (Regulation 18)

As explained above, in 2014 the council agreed to move forward with a single local plan document as it had become evident that the scale of growth that needed to be accommodated within the borough would be significantly greater than previously established in the North West Regional Spatial Strategy (the 2013 Strategic Housing Market...
Assessment has shown a range of 340-485 dwellings a year as the objectively assessed need in Wyre). It was therefore necessary to reconsider anew the overall spatial strategy (i.e. the distribution of development) for the new local plan. This was the main purpose of the Issues and Options document published for consultation in 2015 for (slightly over) a seven week period from 17th June 2015 until 7th August 2015.

It was recognised that the evidence base was suggestive of a significant increase in the housing requirement and as such early consultation on the key issues, vision and objectives and spatial options was important and would enable concerns raised by the community to be taken into account in formulating the draft Local Plan. Importantly, the Issues and Options document identified 136 sites and large areas of land as having the potential for development, with an emphasis on residential, mixed and employment uses. These sites were sourced from Call for Sites consultations and through additional land searches carried out by the local plan team, partly through an on-going review of the 2010 Strategic Housing Land Availability Study (SHLAA).

As Call for Sites exercises have formed an important part of the plan preparation process, before detailing the activities carried out to support the publication of the Issues and Options document it is appropriate to describe the manner in which the Call for Sites was promoted.

The identification of land for subsequent allocation in the local plan has been informed by three key Call for Sites (CfS) exercises. The aim of a CfS is to allow interested parties to suggest land or premises that could be suitable for development or allocation in the local plan.

**Call for Sites 2012**

The 2012 CfS was specifically aimed at informing two pieces of the local plan (at the time this was the Core Strategy – see above) evidence base – an assessment of housing land availability and an assessment of the availability of land for employment and commercial leisure (including retail and leisure). Included in the consultation was a draft methodology for assessing the latter. The CfS was carried out over the period of five weeks from 31 May 2012 to 6 July 2012. Although pre-dating the subsequent move to a single local plan, the 2012 CfS remains part of the current local plan evidence base. It is noted that the 2012 CfS was preceded by earlier exercises aimed at identifying land for housing as part of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments.
The 2012 CfS was promoted in the following ways (see Appendix 3):

- A public notice was placed in the Fleetwood Weekly, Blackpool Reporter and Garstang Courier on 30 May 2012.

- A postal letter was sent to all consultees on the local plan consultation database (372 recipients). This included members of the public, government bodies, local businesses, education and health providers, and interest groups (national and local).

- A letter was sent by e-mail to all planning agents listed on the council’s development management database (282 recipients).

- A letter was sent to all Wyre councillors

- A letter was sent by e-mail to the Wyre council Senior Leadership Team

- An e-mail with full details and documents to the manager of the council’s contact centre

A guidance note and response form were made available on the council’s web site and in paper form.

The 2012 CfS consultation generated 120 site submissions, the majority of which put sites forward for development. Of these, by far the largest category was residential development (58 sites), with a further 17 sites put forward where residential was one of the options suggested. No sites were put forward for Gypsy/traveller or showperson use.

**Call for Sites 2014**

Driven primarily by emerging evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that suggested a significant uplift in the residential Objectively Assessed Need, a further CfS exercise was carried out between 20th February 2014 and 24th March 2014. This sought to identify additional sites over and above those submitted in the 2012 exercise, with a focus on those suitable for residential, employment, retail, leisure and/or Gypsy/Traveller use. As with the 2012 CfS, a response form and guidance note were made available in paper and electronic formats and were placed on the Council’s web site for downloading. The 2014 CfS was promoted in the following ways (see Appendix 4):
A public notice was placed in the Blackpool Gazette, Fleetwood Weekly News and the Garstang Courier.

A letter was sent by post or e-mail as appropriate to all consultees on the local plan consultation database plus planning agents listed on the council’s development management database (831 recipients). This included members of the public, government bodies, local businesses, education and health providers, national and local interest groups and adjoining parishes.

A letter was sent by e-mail to all to Wyre councillors

A separate letter or e-mail as appropriate was sent to the clerk of each of the borough’s parish and town council’s and to the planning ambassadors.

A letter was sent by e-mail to the Wyre council Senior Leadership Team

143 sites were suggested for development through the 2014 CfS exercise (note that some sites were submitted by more than one respondent). Of these 32 had previously been submitted through the 2012 CfS, leaving a total of 111 new sites. As with the 2013 CfS, the vast majority of the new submissions were for residential development (89) or where residential was one of the options suggested (10). One site was put forward for Gypsy/Traveller use.

Those sites that were put forward for residential use only and sites where residential use was proposed as one of a number of potential uses subsequently formed an input into the review of the 2010 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which itself has formed a key part of the process of assessing potential residential allocations.

Sites proposed for non-residential use have been considered as part of the council’s consideration of employment and retail needs.

Call for Sites 2015

In 2014 the three Fylde Coast authorities and Wyre, Fylde and Blackpool undertook a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment to identify the need for pitches (Gypsies/Travellers) and plots (showpeople). For Wyre the need was expressed as 17 pitches and 12 plots. Although the 2014 CfS specifically sought the submission of sites for potential allocation for Gypsies, Travellers and travelling showpeople, there had been a limited response, as noted above. In order to provide a further opportunity to identify potential sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, a bespoke Gypsy and Traveller CfS consultation was carried out between 29th January and 13th March 2015.

The 2015 CfS was promoted in the following ways (see Appendix 5):
A public notice was placed in the Blackpool Gazette, Fleetwood Weekly News and the Garstang Courier.

A letter was sent by post or e-mail as appropriate to all consultees on the local plan consultation database plus planning agents listed on the council’s development management database (1,753 recipients – 1,434 e-mails and 319 letters). This included members of the public, government bodies, local businesses, education and health providers, national and local interest groups and adjoining parishes.

A letter was sent by e-mail to all to Wyre councillors.

A separate letter or e-mail as appropriate was sent to the clerk of each of the borough’s parish and town council’s and to the planning ambassadors.

Letters to a Gypsy and two showpeople who had previously in contact with the council about site identification.

A letter to Wyre Heads of Service.

An e-mail with full details and documents to the manager of the council’s contact centre.

Even though the consultation was extensive, only three sites were submitted for consideration, one of which was for residential as opposed to Gypsy and Traveller use.

The remaining two sites were assessed to be unsuitable – one being a small site in the village of Stalmine with extensive Tree Preservation Order coverage and one in the Green Belt at Poulton-le-Fylde.

**Issues and Options 2015**

The Issues and Options consultation included a suite of documents put on public deposit. These were:

- Issues and Options 2015.
- Issues and Options 2015 – Summary (this was available free for the public to take away).
- Issues and Options 2015 - Response Form (this was available free for the public to take away).
- Interim Sustainability Appraisal of Issues and Options 2015.
- Issues and Options Exhibition – A4 paper copy of the exhibition boards (this was available free for the public to take away).
• Issues and Options 2015 – Leaflet (this was available free for the public to take away).
• Issues and Option 2015 interactive sites map (this was hosted by the Wyre council web site and provided basic details on each site – name, potential use and size in hectares. A link from each site was provided to the consultation portal).

The deposit locations covered were as follows:

• Cleveleys, Fleetwood, Garstang, Knott End, Poulton-le-Fylde and Thornton libraries.
• The rural mobile library and Wyre i-bus.
• Garstang Tourist Information Centre.
• Reception at the Wyre Council Civic Centre, Poulton-le-Fylde.

The suite of documents referred to above were placed in the deposit locations on 15 & 16 June 2015 prior to consultation. A poster listing the deposit locations and dates, times and venues of the exhibition drop-in events was made available, and displayed, at all deposit locations. Posters were also distributed to shops, medical centres, community halls by development management officers during course of their site visits.

Respondents were able to submit comments as follows:

• Electronically via e-mail direct to the planning policy team at Wyre council or through the on-line Objective consultation portal;
• By post (or hand) to the planning policy team; and
• By posting comments in special response boxes, located in the reception at the Wyre Civic Centre, Garstang Tourist Information Centre, Garstang library, Knott-End library, Cleveleys library, Thornton library, Poulton-le-Fylde library and Fleetwood (North Albert Street) library.

Officers worked closely with staff in all deposit locations to ensure that materials were appropriately located and that materials remained available, including those for the public to take away, during the consultation period.

As a key part of engaging with local communities, officers from the local plans and development management teams held a series of staffed exhibitions around the borough. These were held from 2.30pm to 7.30pm at the following venues and times:

• Garstang Library – 25th June 2015
• Poulton Youth and Community Centre – 2nd July 2015
• Thornton Leisure Centre (YMCA) – 6th July 2015
The 2015 Issues and Options consultation was publicised in the following ways (see Appendix 6):


2. All consultees (1273 recipients) on Wyre Local Plan database either written to or emailed between 11 June 2015 (post = 337) and 16 June 2015 (email = 936). This included letters to the specific consultation bodies, Wyre parish and town councils and general consultation bodies, as well as those private individuals held on the local plan database.

3. Briefing for ward members with invite to the borough’s MPs on 10 June 2015 where each member was given a document pack (including posters for dissemination).


5. Briefing for all Wyre council staff on 8, 15 and 16 June 2015.

6. E-mail to the Wyre Engagement Network (an informal network of contacts with an interest in community activity and local issues that have voluntarily signed up to receive new and updates about Wyre, including consultations) 17 June 2015 (122 recipients).

7. E-mail sent to the Wyre Together Network, (a database of community, faith and voluntary sector organisations/groups administrated by Blackpool, Fylde and Wyre Council for Voluntary Services) - 168 members - on 16 June 2015.

8. E-mail to all Wyre e-news subscribers (5620 recipients) on 19 June 2015 which included times/dates of consultation events.

9. E-mail to all members of the Wyred Up (a local business network) database 16th June 2015 (4,000 recipients)


11. Press release to various newspapers including times/dates of events.

and Options consultation events were posted in relevant area based Facebook groups including Garstang Under Threat (now Your Garstang), Garstang Voice, Poulton-le-Fylde Chat, Fleetwood Chat and Thornton Cleveleys Chat. These groups have thousands of members and these postings allowed the council to reach a wider audience than just those who follow the council’s page.

13. Release on Wyre Council Twitter: specifically about the Garstang event
https://mobile.twitter.com/wyrecouncil/status/613995060095381504?p=v

Various local media organisations reported the publication of the Issues and Options document:

1. Article on Garstang Town Council website:
2. Article on the Blackpool, Wyre and Fylde Community Voluntary Sector website:
   http://www.cvsbwf.org/8159-time-to-plan-wyres-future/ (link not active)
3. Article on Blackpool Gazette web site:
5. Article on Lancashire Business View website:
   http://www.lancashirebusinessview.co.uk/time-plan-wyres-future-56458/

The Issues and Options consultation elicited comments from 763 (the briefing note refers to 760 which is an error) organisations and individuals, including a significant proportion from local residents. To enable interested parties to engage with the Issues and Options process, the Issues and Options document set out six questions based around key sections of the document. The Sustainability Appraisal contained a seventh question. The total number of comments received either responding to individual questions or as letters or e-mails, numbered 2,951. A summary of matters raised by question is available as Appendix 7 (in eight parts). The table below provides a breakdown of the number of responses to individual questions. A number of responses did not reference a question and are not included in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you agree that the Spatial Portrait set out above is factually correct? Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have the key issues been identified? Are there any others you feel the Local Plan should address?</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you support the Vision for Wyre and feel that it reflects the key challenges and opportunities? Is there</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anything that should be added to, amended or deleted from the Vision in order to improve it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you agree with the Strategic Objectives? Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Which of the options do you think should be taken forward as the Spatial Strategy showing where development will be directed? Can any of the Options be amended to make it more sustainable, deliverable or to increase the extent to which it would help to achieve the Vision and Strategic Objectives? Is there an alternative or hybrid option which would be more appropriate?</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>See below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have any particular comments/concerns with any of the identified sites? What are the key issues that would need to be considered if any of the identified sites were to be brought forward for development? What additional services and facilities would need to be provided to ensure that development on these sites does not have an unacceptable impact on existing infrastructure? What is the most important infrastructure that needs to be provided within a settlement for it to accommodate new development in a sustainable manner?</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you have any comments to make regarding the Sustainability Appraisal?</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5 allowed respondents to choose a preferred option from the three potential options proposed. Where respondents expressed an opinion, either by answering Q5 and stating a preferred option (433 responses) or by stating an option through a general comment (62 responses), the responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Spatial Strategy</th>
<th>Number of responses in favour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fylde coast peninsula main urban area focus</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A6 corridor focus</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dispersed development</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2 Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 3 Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3 Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 6 allowed respondents to make comments on site put forward as potential allocations. There was a strong response to this question, particularly from members of local communities. Although the Issues and Options document identified a broad range of potential sites located across the borough, there were common themes emerging from the consultation. Overall the response to the potential for significant levels of development – mainly housing – was strongly negative. Concerns included:

- Inappropriate scale of development compared to the existing settlement.
- Lack of services and facilities to support development – particularly health and education infrastructure.
- Insufficient highway capacity or inappropriate local highway network.
- Risk of increasing flooding.
- Loss of countryside and habitat.
- Insufficient evidence of housing needs.

A summary of the main matters arising from the consultation and the council’s response was published on the council’s web site in August 2016 (Appendix 9). The council has also published a summary of the main matters raised in relation to specific sites and the wyre council response (Appendix 10). In August 2016 a Wyre Local Plan Briefing was published to provide an update on the local plan process (Appendix 11). The Briefing cross-referred to the Main Matters document and included a link to the appropriate page on the council’s web site. The council also published alongside the briefing a short Local Plan Questions and Answers document that covered the basics of local planning, including, “What is a Local Plan”?

The Briefing was publicised in the following way:

An email/letter publicising the briefing was sent to 710 consultees (refreshed and updated from the Issues and Options consultation).

A news article was published on the council’s web site

Article in the September edition of Wyre’s community e-newsletter which was sent to 7206 subscribers and is available at:
The council has considered the responses made to the Issues and Options document in developing the Publication Draft Local Plan. Details of how the Plan has responded to the main matters raised can be found in Appendix 9.

6. Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 (Regulation 19)

Consultation

On 22 September 2017, the council published for public consultation the Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017. The consultation period was for six-weeks and ended at 5pm 3 November 2017.

The Publication Draft Local Plan consultation included a suite of documents put on public deposit in the following locations:

- Fleetwood, Garstang, Knott End and Poulton-le-Fylde libraries.
- Thornton YMCA
- Cleveleys Community Church and Centre
- Wyre Council Civic Centre reception.
- The rural mobile library and Wyre i-bus.
- Reception at the Wyre Council Civic Centre, Poulton-le-Fylde.

It is noted that since the publication of the Issues and Options document of 2015, libraries at Cleveleys and Thornton have closed. Consequently the council identified alternative locations for these areas (i.e. the Community Church and YMCA). The council wishes to record its gratitude to these organisations, and the other deposit locations, for the assistance they have given.

Documents placed on deposit in the above locations were:

- Publication Draft Local Plan 2017 Written Statement.
- Publication Draft Local Plan 2017 policies map and map pack.
- Sustainability Appraisal.
- Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Statement of Representations.
• Publication Draft Local Plan 2017 response form (this was available free for the public to take away).
• Publication Draft Local Plan 2017 response form guidance note (available free for the public to take away).
• Publication Draft Local Plan 2017 leaflet/poster (this was available free for the public to take away).

The suite of documents referred to above were placed in the deposit locations on 21 September prior to the beginning of the consultation.

A poster listing the deposit locations and dates was made available, and displayed, at all deposit locations.

Officers worked closely with staff in all deposit locations to ensure that materials were appropriately located and that materials remained available, including those for the public to take away, during the consultation period.

As explained above, the council has sought to work with parish and town councils throughout the plan preparation process. In light of the important role of the parish and town council’s the council made available to each a set of documents in paper form to use as part of their consultation with their respective communities. The pack consisted of those documents that the council was seeking direct comment on (the Publication Draft Local Plan and Sustainability Appraisal), comment forms and guidance notes, posters/leaflets and Statement of Representations.

In addition to the above documents the council also published on its web site (web address given in the guidance note and leaflet/poster):

1. A series of background papers designed to provide additional detail on the development of policies and allocations. These covered:
   • Green Belt and Strategic Areas of Separation
   • Green Infrastructure
   • Housing
   • Settlement Boundaries
   • Site Allocations

2. A series of Technical Assessments supports the local plan process:
   • Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal – Interim SA of Issues and Options 2015, June 2015
• Wyre Local Plan to 2031 Sustainability Appraisal Report - Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal (includes appendices and non-technical summary), August 2017
• Equality Impact Assessment, August 2017
• Wyre Borough Council Local Plan Habitats Regulations Assessment Report, September 2017
• Wyre Infrastructure Delivery Plan to Support the Publication Draft Local Plan, September 2017
• Local Plan and Site Allocations Viability Study, October 2017
• Statement of Consultation with Appendices, September 2017

The council also published a statement on compliance with the Duty to Co-operate.

The Local Plan is supported by an extensive evidence base which is available electronically on the Wyre Council web site and in paper from the council’s Civic Centre offices.

At the time of the Publication of the Publication Draft Local Plan all of the evidence base, background and technical documents were available to view and download at the council’s web site www.wyre.gov.uk/localplan and view or purchase at the Wyre Civic Centre, apart from the Local Plan and Site Allocations Viability Study, which was published in October 2017.

Respondents were able to submit responses by the following means:

• Electronically via e-mail direct to the planning policy team at Wyre council or through the on-line Objective consultation portal;
• By post (or hand) to the planning policy team; and
• By posting comments in special response boxes, located in the reception at the Wyre Civic Centre, Garstang library, Knott-End library, Cleveleys Community Church and Centre, Thornton YMCA, Poulton-le-Fylde library and Fleetwood (North Albert Street) library.

The 2017 Publication Draft Local Plan consultation was publicised in the following ways (Appendix 12):


2. All consultees (830 recipients) on Wyre Local Plan database either written to or emailed between 20 September (post = 119) and 21 September (email = 711). This included letters to the specific consultation bodies, Wyre parish and town councils and general consultation bodies, as well as those private individuals held on the local plan database.
3. e-mail to ward members 21 September 2017 including Statement of Representations, representation form and guidance note. Briefing note e-mailed on 22 September 2017 to all ward members.

4. e-mail to Wyre Council Senior Management Team 21 September 2017 including Statement of Representations and briefing note.

5. Leaflet/poster displayed in the deposit locations and copies made available to the Parish/Town Council’s for local dissemination as required.

6. Press release to various newspapers and media contacts including times/dates of events.

7. News release on Wyre Council Home page “It’s time for you to have your say on the publication draft Wyre local plan” 22 September 2017
   
   http://www.wyre.gov.uk/news/article/1453/it_s_time_for_you_to_have_your_say_on_the_publication_draft_wyre_local_plan


9. E-mail to the Wyre Engagement Network (an informal network of contacts with an interest in community activity and local issues that have voluntarily signed up to receive new and updates about Wyre, including consultations) and consultation subscribers 22 September 2017 (6,312 recipients).

10. E-mail sent to all Wyre e-news subscribers (7,986 subscribers) on 2 October 2017.

11. E-mail to all members of the Wyred Up (a local business network) database 25 September 2017 (1,157 recipients).

12. Release on Wyre Council Facebook page and Twitter account, 22 and 23 September 2017

13. Officers attended a meeting of Lancashire Association of Local Councils (a body of parish and town councils) on 25 October 2017 to publicise and discuss the Publication Draft Local Plan and the consultation.

The council also publicised the Local Plan on its Twitter account on the 22 and 23 September 2018.

Various local media organisations reported the publication of the Issues and Options document:
A total of 1,151 representations were received as valid from 253 individuals and organisations. A significant proportion of responses were made by local residents. The council also received six late responses, with one additional late response that had been submitted within the time period but was resubmitted late with additional text. These have not been considered further.

A number of responses were received where the requirements of data protection had not been complied with. The council made every effort to ensure responses were data protection compliant (including authorisation to pass personal details onto the Planning Inspectorate), with e-mails, ‘phone calls and letters to those that has not provided the appropriate information. Although this met with some success, seven responses have been declared as invalid as a result of the failure to meet data protection requirements. Finally,
one representation was received with no name or other personal details. This was therefore also deemed to be invalid.

In summary:

Valid responses = 253

Late (not valid) = 6

Not data protection compliant or lacked personal details (not valid) = 8

Total = 267

At the Publication Stage representations are invited on specific matters, namely:

1. Whether or not the Plan is legally compliant;
2. Whether or not the Plan meets the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate; and
3. Whether or not the Plan is “sound”, that is:
   - Positively prepared - This means that the Local Plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.
   - Justified - The Local Plan should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.
   - Effective - The Local Plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.
   - Consistent with national policy - The Local Plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The response form also sought representations on the Sustainability Appraisal.

The following table summarises the nature of each of the 1,151 representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neither yes or no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Do you consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant?</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Does the Local Plan comply with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The council has produced a summary of the matters raised by each representation received and an appropriate response has been provided – this has been produced as Appendix 14, with additional matters/responses produced for the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (Appendix 15), allocation SA1/13 Inskip Extension (Appendix 16), highway matters (Appendix 17) and local plan viability (Appendix 18). A table showing the numerical distribution according to the part of the local plan commented upon (comments on soundness and general comments) has been produced as Appendix 19 to this report.

The council has also published a copy of each representation made – these should be referred to appreciate the full comment made in each case.

**Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 – Main Matters**

The council are required by Regulation 22 to produce a summary of the main matters raised.

**Legal Compliance**

The council received 109 representations on legal compliance, the majority of which viewed the council as having met its legal obligations. 43 respondents view the council as having failed its legal obligations. Of these, 12 respondents did not produce a reason for this view. In respect of the remaining 31 respondents who expressed a reason for their view of non-legal compliance, the matters raised include:

- Lack of community involvement. No previous consultation carried out in terms of the allocation of SA6 for Travelling Showpeople. Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council “gagged”/prevented from discussing potential proposals for Inskip with the wider community. Six week consultation insufficient.
- The Plan will exacerbate existing problems, particularly in the west of the borough and is not based on a sound evidence base.
- Lack of infrastructure to support development in rural villages. Lack of information on requirements in relation to utilities and highway infrastructure.
The council has not met the requirements of the Regulations in relation to the distribution of material by electronic means.

- No separate statement on legal compliance. No information on legal compliance.
- No policy to protect community and cultural facilities.
- Failure to comply with Article 1 of the SEA Directive – failing to protect the environment. No proper evaluation of environmental effects and no alternatives considered.
- Lack of evidence of discussions with adjoining authorities. Failure to meet the Duty to Cooperate.
- Proposals contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly in relation to large village extensions.
- No local heritage list.
- Overly complicated document/process.

**Duty to Cooperate**

The ‘Duty to Cooperate’ is set out in Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 which states that it applies to all Local Planning Authorities (LPAs), National Park Authorities and County Councils in England. A separate Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate has been prepared detailing how the Council has fulfilled this obligation with regards to the preparation of the Local Plan.

**Soundness and General Comments**

As can be seen, 518 responses were to the effect that the Plan is not sound. Respondents were able to identify up to four reasons for non-compliance with the soundness test. Responses against these reasons were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not positively prepared</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not justified</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not consistent with national policy</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments were made on a range of policies and parts of the plan as summarised in Appendix 14. The following provides a summary of the matters raised in relation to the content of the Local Plan on the basis of soundness and including those made as general comments. It is organised by Local Plan chapter and policy. **Please note that this does not**
cover every issue raised – please see the council’s summary of each representation in Appendix 14 and the original full representations for further details.

Introduction

The Plan introduction details the preparation of the Plan, including reference to legal compliance, the Duty to Cooperate and the process of stakeholder engagement. The council received seven comments on the Introduction. Of these one was a general comment whilst six were on soundness; all of the latter regarded the Plan as unsound.

Matters raised include:

- Plan time frame not consistent with the NPPF recommended 15 year post adoption period. Start date of 2011 not consistent with the evidence base.
- No thread through to the previous Core Strategy Preferred Options document and lack of clarity regarding how comments made on the Issues and Options document have been taken into account.
- Concerns that the engagement process with respect to the village of Inskip was not open, did not allow for the involvement of local residents and Parish Council concerns not taken into account in the subsequent allocation of site SA1/13.
- Leaving key development decisions to later Supplementary Planning documents undermines the fundamental principles of plan-making.

Spatial Portrait and Key Issues

The Spatial Portrait sets the context for the Plan by illustrating key characteristics and features of the borough and identified the key issues that emerge from this analysis. The council received 24 comments on this section. Of these, most (22) related to soundness of which 21 stated that the Plan is not sound. Many of the points raised do not directly comment on the content of the information contained in the spatial portrait or key challenges, but are comments on various matters, both detailed and strategic.

A common theme amongst the representations was in relation to the scale of proposed development being out of proportion to the capabilities of the highway network to accommodate current traffic flows (leading to congestion) and future flows.

Comments on highway and transport matters included:

- Housing development should be located close to jobs and services/facilities to reduce commuting and use of the car. Insufficient explanation of, and regard to, the decline in employment in the peninsula settlements and growth in commuting with its consequent congestion impacts on the highway network.
The highway evidence lacks understanding of the impact of potential development on rural lanes, including those in the vicinity of Inskip.

- No traffic surveys that identify potential traffic problems.
- No mention of a need for a light rail link between Poulton-le-Fylde and Fleetwood.
- Need for a junction on the M6 near Garstang to alleviate congestion on the A6, whilst development in Thornton or Poulton-le-Fylde should be timed to take place after the Singleton bypass is constructed.

Other matters raised include:

- Inappropriate growth of rural settlements that will become more urbanised.
- The growth in the elderly detailed in the Spatial Portrait is not matched by a strategy that places housing growth in sustainable locations and instead focuses on settlements such as Inskip and Forton that lack appropriate services and facilities.
- There should be a greater emphasis on evidencing the need for smaller, and more affordable, houses, and a greater mix of houses, including bungalows.
- There should be a greater emphasis on the more efficient use of the existing dwelling stock rather than building on greenfield sites.
- The Plan does not pay sufficient regard to Green Infrastructure and does not properly recognise or address the fact that open space standards are not being met in certain locations (for example Thornton and Fleetwood). The Plan should set out where public open space will be provided in relation to proposed housing developments.
- Lack on emphasis on air quality and the consequences on such of new development in the peninsula.
- Developments are already coming forward in advance of any masterplanning as suggested by the Plan.
- Need to allocate land for school expansion and new schools.

In addition to the above, there was support for the Plan’s recognition of the significance of Morecambe Bay for tourism and leisure.

**Vision and Objectives**

The vision sets out what kind of borough Wyre aspires to be by 2031. The Plan states that the overarching aim is to promote sustainable growth that balances the three aspects of sustainability and creates sustainable communities. The Plan sets out 12 objectives to achieve the vision and stated aim.

The council received 33 comments on this section. Of these, six were general comments and 27 related to soundness of which the majority (22) stated that the Plan is not sound.
Overall, the comments were therefore critical of various aspects of the council’s approach. An overriding theme from residents and developers/landowners is that the Plan’s content does not match the vision and specific objectives, albeit that residents and developers have opposing reasons for their views, with residents more inclined to the view that large sale allocations in rural village runs contrary to the vision and objectives, whereas those with an interest in developing land felt that the “failure” to allocate sufficient land against the Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (OANH) is in itself a barrier to the achievement of the vision. Many of the matters raised followed similar themes to those identified through the Spatial Portrait and Key Issues, and include:

- The failure to meet the objectively assessed housing need, and hence lack of sufficient allocations in sustainable allocations, brings into question the ability of the council to meet the vision.
- Undue emphasis on the highway constraints ahead of economic and social matters.
- Insufficient account taken of the sustainability of rural communities. Objective 12 from the previous Issues and Options document that seeks to ensure the sustainability of rural communities has been omitted.
- Achieving the vision/objectives is linked to improving transport connectivity. A fundamental review of a required road infrastructure is required.
- There needs to be a clear set of goals to resolve a shortfall in open space provision.
- The Plan fails to demonstrate that the council regards the historic environment as a strategic priority.
- There is no policy or set of ideas to address the needs of an ageing population, whilst allocations for residential development in villages are regarded as unsustainable and will not address the demand for housing from this group.
- There needs to be an emphasis on tourism and well as the visitor economy. A concern was expressed that the emphasis on tourism in the Issues and Option document, which included a specific objective on this matter, has been omitted.
- The loss of farmland will impact on village character and runs contrary to the idea that farming will be a dominant characteristic of the rural area.
- There is no clear statement that the vision is for a borough with enhanced biodiversity and improved ecological network.

With regard to the objectives, a number of comments relate to objective 7 which is concerned with the protection and enhancement of the borough’s natural and heritage assets, the following matters being raised:

- Support for objective 7 but the emphasis should not just be on high quality design but on protecting and enhancing environmental assets for their inherent value.
• Insufficiently strong recognition that the historic environment will be an integral component of the future success of the borough.
• Need to include a specific objective to enhance biodiversity and improve ecological networks.
• Discord between the objective and current houses under development that do not improve the character of the area.
• Insufficient protection for the amenity of sensitive receptors including residents and businesses from the adverse impacts of development.

It is also noted that there was concern that the Plan, by virtue of the allocation of development land in rural villages, is contrary to objective eight which protects the separate identity of individual settlements.

There was also explicit support for objective 4 where the development of housing can ensure that needs are met in the right locations, objective 5 that requires development to be supported by essential infrastructure, and objective 6 in relation the importance of connectivity between uses by a range of transport choices.

**Local Plan Strategy**

The Local Plan strategy balances competing interests between the protection of the borough’s important environmental assets whilst delivering the development that supports the borough’s population and businesses. This tension is reflected in the comments received. Overall there were 30 comments on the strategy. Of these, only two were general comments, with 28 related to soundness of which all stated that the Plan is not sound. Virtually all responses either concerned the inability of the council to allocate sufficient land to meet the full objectively assessed need for housing or the inappropriate allocation of dwellings in rural villages, particularly Inskip. These are common themes throughout the comments received on different aspects of the Plan. As part of this Statement of Consultation, the council has produced a summary of matters raised in relation to the objectively assessed need for housing (Appendix 15) and in relation to Inskip (Appendix 16). The summaries also include the council’s response to the matters raised. **To avoid repetition, matters relating to the objectively assessed housing need are summarised under policy SP1 below and those relating to site allocations are summarised under policies SA1 and SA3.** Other more general matters raised in response to the Plan strategy are:

• No joined up strategy to tackle lack of employment opportunities, poor transport connectivity, high commuting levels and congestion, the under provision of public open space.
• No plan to improve antiquated agricultural highway infrastructure.
There should be a greater emphasis on developing brownfield site and on protecting greenfield land/farm land.

No reference to biodiversity and ecological networks in relation to green infrastructure.

The Plan is overly driven by the objectively assessed housing need and insufficient weight has been given to constraints such as flood risk and the presence of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The strategy of dispersal does not accord with the demand profile which is for housing in the main population and employment centres.

Solutions to highway constraints in sustainable locations should be addressed so that additional land can be released with less development required in rural areas/villages.

**Strategic Policies**

The Strategic Policies set out the overall framework for development in Wyre aiming to ensure that development takes place within environmental limits. The Strategic Policies chapter contains eight policies setting out the development strategy. It establishes policies for strategic designations (including the Green Belt and countryside), viability, infrastructure provision and health. Overall there were 138 comments on the strategic policies. Of these, 39 were general comments and 99 relate to soundness of which the majority – 85 - stated that the Plan is not sound.

Policy SP1 – which establishes the overall development strategy including setting the amount of housing to be delivered in the Plan period, establishing the settlement hierarchy and setting the policy basis of Strategic Areas of Separation - and received the most comments in this chapter (57) of which 12 are general comments and 45 relate to soundness, of which 40 consider the plan to be unsound. Many representations concerned:

- The inability of the council to allocate sufficient land to meet the full objectively assessed need for housing;
- The inappropriate allocation of dwellings in rural villages, particularly Inskip.
- The highway capacity and the consequent constraint on development.

The council has produced a summary of matters raised in relation to the objectively assessed housing need and housing supply (Appendix 15). In summary, matters relating to the objectively assessed housing need include:

- More evidence required to demonstrate why the objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) need cannot be met. Not all options have been explored.
The council has not explored the implications of failing to meet OAHN especially in relation to the supply of working population and delivery of affordable housing.

The plan OAHN should be based on latest government figures of 313 not 479pa. The allocations are not based on locally assessed need.

It has not been adequately demonstrated why using Liverpool not Sedgefield approach to addressing the backlog of housing growth for the Local Plan.

The council should apply a 20% buffer to the Local Plan housing requirement to provide sufficient development opportunities. The council has a persistent record of housing under-delivery.

Based on Strategic Housing Market Assessment the OAHN should be 513 to support forecast job growth and the delivery of affordable housing.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan should address infrastructure constrains to ensure that development is maximised.

Duty to Cooperate - further justification required for how shortfall can be met with neighbouring authorities.

No windfall allowance. A windfall allowance could assist in encouraging suitable sites to come forward and help deliver a greater amount of residential development over the plan period.

The overall approach to build out rates is unclear. No justification provided for deviating from standard build out rate assumptions.

Matters raised in relation to site allocations are addressed below and specifically in Appendix 16 regarding Inskip. Matters raised in relation to the highway evidence are addressed in Appendix 17.

Other matters raised in response to Policy SP1 are:

- Allocations are leading to a loss of agricultural land whereas brownfield land should be preferred.
- There is no joined up strategy to tackle lack of employment opportunities, poor transport connectivity, high commuting levels and congestion, the under provision of public open space.
- Appropriate that traffic modelling of the current proposals is undertaken so that appropriate mitigation measures can be identified.
- A realistic plan for the delivery of highway improvements is required.
- Housing growth is in excess of population growth and hence contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Placing 46% of housing in the urban peninsula locations – which has little open space - is unsustainable owing to poor employment opportunities resulting in more commuting – hence not a sustainable Plan.
There should be an infrastructure delivery fund to address constraints and therefore release additional development land.

The approach to allocations by the council has been “top down” – NPPF requires local authorities to work with communities.

SP1 shows low employment growth but high housing growth in rural areas which is unsustainable.

Settlements lower down the settlement hierarchy such as Inskip are taking a disproportionately large amount of new housing.

The Plan need to ensure that mechanisms are in place to ensure that settlements assumed to function at a lower level within the settlement hierarchy can “migrate” up the sustainability ladder.

The strategy does not reflect the position of Garstang within the settlement hierarchy as a sustainable location which can accommodate additional housing development.

The Plan strategy is based, in part, on a Green Belt review that is not justified by exceptional circumstances. Alternative non-Green Belt sites should have been considered in advance of any decision to amend the Green Belt boundary to allow the allocation of Green Belt land for housing.

The use of settlement boundaries sets a limit of development that is contrary to the NPPF which supports the delivery of sustainable development.

The Strategic Areas of Separation policy is not justified by reference to national policy or any supporting evidence.

Both Blackpool and Fylde council have made detailed comments on SP1 which fundamentally argue that the scale of the objectively assessed housing need is over estimated and that the council should adopt a strategy that ensures needs are met within the borough boundary.

There was some support within the representations (with five indicating soundness) for the overall strategy, the identification of strategic areas of separation, the limiting of development beyond settlement boundaries, and support for a flexibility approach to appropriate tourism development outside of defined boundaries.

Policy SP2 establishes the approach to sustainable development. A total of 16 representations have been received of which five are general comments and 11 relate to soundness of which nine consider the Plan to be unsound. Matters raised include:

- The scale and location of development – with specific reference to the urban peninsula, A6 corridor and Inskip – is contrary to the principles of sustainable development as defined by SP2, owing to a deficiency in services and facilities (e.g. health and education), potential for development to lead to an increase in flooding,
lack of local employment opportunities leading to increased commuting by car and increased congestion, loss of open space, visual harm, and loss of agricultural land.

- Allocations will lead to rural settlements becoming dormitory suburbs or urbanised.
- Rural allocations are not as sustainable as urban allocations.
- The requirement of criterion 4 regarding the creation of “sustainable communities” is not supported by the NPPF which only uses this term in relation to heritage assets (NPPF para. 131). The criterion should not give primacy to location and accessibility over and above other aspects of sustainability.
- The Policy should not suggest that development should address all three strands of sustainable development as defined by the NPPF (see SP2 criterion 5). In some cases sites will be unable to address all three strands. Development can be sustainable if meeting only two of the strands and this should be reflected in the policy.
- The principles relating to climate change (criterion 8) are too vague and contrary to large residential allocations (e.g. SA1/13 Inskip) whereas smaller allocations are more effective in mitigating the causes of and adapting to climate change.

There was some support for the overall approach of supporting sustainable development, including from some representors who indicated a lack of soundness albeit in the context of identifying desired changes to the policy.

SP3 establishes the policy for the Green Belt. A total of nine representations have been received of which four are general comments and five relate to soundness. Of these five representations four considered the Plan to be unsound. Overall, representations reflected both support for the Green Belt and SP3 and criticisms of the council’s approach.

Matters raised include:

- Opposition to the loss of any Green Belt land particularly in the context of artificially high housing and employment figures based on improbable growth projections. The proposed loss of Green Belt is contrary to national policy.
- A further amendment to the Green Belt boundary may be necessary to accommodate the need for further housing allocations in Wyre. The Green Belt tightly constrains development in the most sustainable locations.
- There is a lack of clarity with regard to the relationship between SP3, which allows for development of affordable housing in the Green Belt, and HP7 which addresses Rural Exception sites but does not specifically mention whether or not this applies to the Green Belt.
- Parts (2), (5) and (6) are introducing new policy and are contrary to the NPPF.
- Specific additional land release needed by extending residential allocation SA1/11 (Norcross) and by allocating new housing at Normoss Road (Poulton-le-Fylde).
There is a lack of safeguarded land to address development needs beyond the Plan period.

Supporting representations highlight the importance of the Green Belt as a means of protecting the health and well-being of residents and the approach to allowing operational development in relation to educational establishments in the Green Belt (part (5)). There was also support for the proposed release of land from the Green Belt at Poulton-le-Fylde (including residential allocation SA1/8) from a developer.

SP4 establishes the policy for the designated countryside. A total of 22 representations have been received of which seven are general comments and 15 relate to soundness. Of these, 14 representations considered the Plan to be unsound.

Matters raised include:

- Protecting the open and rural character of the countryside for its own sake is contrary to the NPPF, including para. 113 which supports a criteria based approach. Within national policy openness and permanence are functions of the Green Belt not the countryside.
- The extent of the countryside should be reconsidered to ensure the council can meet its objectively assessed housing need. Because a development may have an adverse impact on the openness of the countryside does not automatically mean development is unsustainable.
- The designation of tight settlement boundaries and the countryside is not in-line with the principle of sustainable development. The NPPF requires a balancing “cost/benefit” approach which the absolute precision of the countryside policy does not permit. The approach of part 2 of the policy which limits acceptable uses to a specific list is contrary to the “cost/benefit” approach which would allow for other uses to be developed and is also inconsistent with part 1 of the policy (which seeks to protect the openness of the countryside).
- Part 4 of the policy that places a priority order on uses acceptable where the conversion of existing buildings is proposed (with residential as the least suitable option) is contrary to the NPPF especially where there is a shortfall in housing needs.
- On the other hand, the view has been expressed that the criteria for the consideration of conversions in the countryside should be more onerous, with exceptional reasons required for conversion to residential use.
- Part 6 of the policy allows for the removal of PD rights – this is contrary to para. 206 of the NPPF.
- The allocation of SA1/13 for residential development in the countryside at Inskip is contrary to the policy. Significant in scale and attracts negative scores in the
Sustainability Appraisal for landscape/townscape character, views, water and biodiversity.

SP5 establishes the policy for the Forest of Bowland AONB. A total of five representations have been received of which four are general comments and one relates to soundness (which considered the Plan to be sound). The representations are generally supportive.

Policy SP6 establishes how the council will assess the viability of proposals where an applicant seeks a reduced contribution to infrastructure or other policy requirements. Policy SP7 establishes the basis for those infrastructure provisions and developer contributions. In total the council received 20 representations across the two policies, of which six were general comments and 14 related to soundness, 11 of which considered the Plan to be unsound. There was general support for the principle of both policies and the flexibility within them, albeit with concerns about matters of detail. The council has produced a response to matters concerning viability (Appendix 18). In summary, matters raised in relation to viability and infrastructure delivery include:

- To be effective a totally different policy approach is needed as the council has previously failed to achieve the desired or promised infrastructure and policy requirements.
- The application of the policy should be proportionate to the complexity and scale of the proposals.
- There should be an acknowledgement that meeting the needs of the historic environment may impact on development viability and infrastructure/planning requirements.
- Requirements should be based on robust evidence. Policy SP6 is contrary to the NPPF which requires policies to be clear in how a decision maker should react to development proposals. Although the principle of a policy that allows a developer to negotiate a reduction in requirements, there are concerns over assumptions in the Viability Study (October 2017).
- Open book approach acceptable in principle but commercially sensitive material should be treated appropriately.
- Minimum standards for affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements should be adhered to.
- The policy should refer to the planning obligation tests set out in the NPPF. Contributions should be justified and based on a credible evidence base (SP7).
- Policy SP7 should allow for viability and developer contributions to be balanced against the constructive use of heritage assets.
- Village enhancements should be added to the list of infrastructure requirements at part 4 of SP7.
Part 4 of SP7 is imprecise. The policy should allow for planning obligations to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Policy SP8 sets out the approach to health and well-being. The council received seven representations, of which one was a general comment and six related to soundness, five of which considered the Plan to be unsound.

Matters raised include:

- The policy is too broad and not sufficiently specific.
- The policy lacks clarity:
  - No clear guidance on when a Health Impact Assessment will be required and no guidance on a process for identifying health impacts. Part 3 takes a negative view of the role of development in addressing health impacts whereas development can provide positive health impacts for instance through the developments of new homes.
  - The policy in part 3 struggles to define those circumstances in which development may be judged to have a health impact.
- Part 3 is only concerned with the borough’s population. Instead the policy should be more broadly applicable to the health and well-being of visitors, tourists and those working in the borough.
- Concern that the cumulative effect of development in rural areas will have a detrimental effect on health provision.
- No evidence that open space targets are being met.

**Core Development Management Policies**

The Core Development Management Policies provide the general development management policy framework.

A total of 78 representations have been received on this section of the Plan, of which 33 are general comments and 45 relate to soundness, of which 35 consider the Plan to be unsound.

There were two new core development management policies proposed, both by the Environment Agency, one seeking a specific policy on Sustainable Drainage and one seeking a policy on protecting controlled waters from pollution.

CDMP1 establishes the requirements of environmental protection. A total of six representations have been received of which one was as general comment and five relate to soundness, of which three representations consider the Plan to be sound and two consider the Plan to be unsound. Overall, therefore there was support for the policy although two
respondents felt that the position that developments meet the requirement of “all” CDMP policies is unrealistic and hence unsound.

CDMP2 addressees flood risk and surface water management. A total of 15 representations have been received of which three are general comments and 12 relate to soundness, of which 11 representations consider the Plan to be unsound. In the main, concerns came from the development industry which expressed a view that the requirements of parts 5, 6 and 7 (relating to surface water management) are over prescriptive and contrary to national policy, including:

- The requirement to achieve greenfield run-off rates needs to be balanced against a range of considerations including viability and the nature of the site – the requirement should not apply to brownfield sites. The requirement is contrary to the written statement on Sustainable Drainage Systems. National policy does not require “all” development to achieve greenfield run-off rates.
- The requirement for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) may not be appropriate (for instance due to site conditions) or viable. The national policy is that SuDS is a propriety not an absolute requirement of development.
- Not all steps in part 6 will be appropriate in any particular case and as such the policy is too rigid.

Other comments reflected a concern that development (allocations) was being allowed in areas of flood risk, whereas the opposite view – that development should be allowed in flood zone 2 – was also expressed.

CDMP3 establishes the design policy. A total of nine representations have been received of which five are general comments and four relate to soundness, of which three representations consider the Plan to be unsound. Overall the representations are supportive albeit with the caveat that a number seek detailed amendments to the policy, including:

- There should be a greater emphasis on connecting people and places as per NPPF para. 6.1.
- There is no detail on how design should respond to climate change.
- It should be made clear that development should respond to local character and historical patterns of development. Design outcomes should respond to local character.
- There should be a presumption in favour of development that demonstrates a good standard of design.
CDMP4 is a detailed policy that establishes the development management regime for environmental assets. A total of twenty six representations have been received of which 12 are general comments and 14 relate to soundness, of which 10 representations consider the Plan to be unsound. Many matters raised include were in relation to the Green Infrastructure element of the policy and included the following issues:

- The approach to Green Infrastructure (GI) is overly prescriptive – the policy should be more flexible and GI matters should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
- Not clear how development will be expected to protect and enhance the functionality of GI.
- No clear strategy for the GI network.
- Improvements to GI can only be required to mitigate the impact of development not because the council believes it to be beneficial.
- The designation of the whole of the countryside as GI is misleading unhelpful – it is not clear how this meets the definition of GI within the NPPF.
- The GI policy should seek to integrate sustainable development opportunities within the existing landscape rather than offer blanket protection.
- Inclusion of sports fields within GI is welcomed. Mitigation and compensation should be based on a sound evidence base.
- The policy should acknowledge that GI has heritage value in its own right, including trees within conservation areas and historically important hedgerows.
- Only identified GI should be protected by the policy where there is evidenced need based on an up-to-date assessment.
- Garstang showground should be designated as GI.

Other matters raised against the policy included:

- Off-site compensation and mitigation should be in the immediate locality of the development.
- The visual benefits of environmental assets should be recognised as making a significant contribution to the character of a place.
- Measures to achieve net biodiversity benefit should be proportionate and relevant to each site. Not all measures may be appropriate in any particular instance.
- The policy should allow for the loss of trees where this can be compensation by sufficient planting within the site. Only the highest quality trees should be protected.
- The policy should reference the need to increase tree cover over the borough. There should be a presumption in favour of protecting and preserving trees.
- Development that meets housing needs should have greater weight that the protection of agricultural land.
• The loss of good quality agricultural land and habitat through the allocation of SA1/13 – Inskip Extension is contrary to the policy.
• Allocation policies should identify if a site is within 3.5km of Morecambe Bay SPA.
• The policy indicates that in all cases off site compensation/mitigation will be treated as acceptable whereas it may not be possible to treat all impacts off site.

CDMP5 establishes the policy on the historic environment. A total of eight representations have been received of which five are general comments and three relate to soundness, of which two representations consider the Plan to be unsound. Historic England provided a number of suggested wordings changes which the council has taken on board. Overall, matters raised included:

• No reference to any positive strategy for the conservation of the historic environment (as per NPPF para. 126).
• The requirement for direct enhancement of heritage assets that are outside of the control of an applicant or the council is undeliverable.
• Reference should be made to the importance of listed buildings and conservation areas.
• No reference to local listings or the role of conservation area appraisals.
• The requirement to assess heritage assets should be proportionate to the relationship to the proposed development.
• A more flexible and iterative approach to archaeology is required such that the low importance/quality findings should not hold back development.
• There should be a cultural heritage clause that prevents building on the beach.

CDMP 6 concerns accessibility and transport, including reference to Electric Vehicle Recharging (EVR) and public rights of way. A total of 12 representations have been received of which five are general comments and seven relate to soundness, all of which consider the Plan to be unsound. Matters raised included:

• The policy does not allow developments which will “adversely” affect Public Rights of Way.
• The full extent of a PROW should be protected including those parts on the public highway.
• Any required re-routing of a PROW may be undeliverable as this is subject to a separate procedure outside of the planning regime.
• Allocation SA1/13 – Inskip Extension is adjacent to a PROW and therefore contrary to CDMP6.
• No evidence for the requirement for development to include EVR points. No assessment of the impact on the viability of development. Policy wording is
ambiguous as it does not provide guidance on the threshold for the application of the policy. The policy therefore conflicts with the NPPF.

- Reference should be made to the constraints on development imposed by the highway network.
- Development should only be refused where impacts on the highway network are “severe”. The requirements of part (3) of the policy which requires off-site mitigation where impacts are “adverse” is contrary to national policy.

Matters in relation to the viability of the policy in respect of EVR points are addressed in Appendix 18.

**Housing**

The housing section establishes the housing supply for the plan period and sets out the requirements for new housing developments including policies on housing mix and affordable housing. A total of 87 representations have been received on this chapter, of which 18 are general comments and 69 relate to soundness. Of the latter, 56 consider the Plan to be unsound.

Policy HP1 establishes the housing land supply. A total of 29 representations have been received – mostly from the development industry - of which four are general comments and 25 relate to soundness, all of which consider the Plan to be unsound. The majority of representations consider that the council’s proposed housing land supply does not accord with the objectively assessed need for housing. This is the uniform view of those from the development industry. Representations from community-based organisations and the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) are equally uniformly of the view that the housing land supply is too great. As part of this Statement of Consultation, the council has produced a summary of issues raised in relation to the objectively assessed need for housing and housing supply (Appendix 15). Other matters raised in relation to policy HP1 include:

- There should be a housing infrastructure fund to resolve matters concerning the highway constraints to support housing growth.
- Disproportionate growth at Forton not consistent with the very limited infrastructure and lack of local employment opportunities. The highways cap does not address the (lack of) connectivity between Forton and major employment areas on the peninsula.
- The housing supply figure should be set as a minimum to allow for more housing should the highway evidence indicate greater highway capacity.
- The Duty to Cooperate statement does not indicate where unmet needs will be met.
Policy HP2 requires developments to accommodate a mix of housing, including housing for older people and those with restricted mobility. A total of 13 representations have been received, all relating to soundness, 11 of which consider the Plan to be unsound. Almost all representations are from the development industry. A common theme is the desire for greater flexibility in the application of the policy, allowing local circumstances/market demand to be taken into account. Most of these representations are concerned with the requirements in relation to older people and those with restricted mobility. Matters raised include:

- No evidence to justify the 20% requirement relating to older people and those with restricted mobility.
- Question impact on viability of development – not properly tested.
- Lack of guidance on what a design suitable for these groups actually means.
- No evidence provided on why this aspect of the policy applies to developments 20 dwellings and above.
- Criterion 2 of the policy already allows these groups to be taken into account.
- Insufficient flexibility with the policy to reflect local needs and viability considerations.
- The policy appears to require 20% provision for older people and those with restricted mobility in addition to the 30% need for affordable housing.

HP3 sets out the policy on affordable housing. A total of 18 representations have been received of which four are general comments and 14 relate to soundness, 11 of which consider the Plan to be unsound. There is some support for the principle of affordable housing provision, including from those who consider the policy as unsound on a matter of policy wording.

Overall, matters raised include:

- The 30% target is insufficient to meet the housing needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- 30% target is unrealistic given other policy requirements and hence the viability of the policy is questionable.
- More housing allocations should be made to support the delivery of more affordable housing (on market-led sites).
- The 30% affordable housing requirement for Forton/Hollins Lane should be reduced to 20% as there is insufficient local employment.
- A charge for affordable housing should be applied to all developments.
- Flexibility should be incorporated within the policy to allow for the retrospective renegotiation of affordable housing where economic factors have changed.
• Concern that the council will not fully implement the policy to achieve the targets as developers can make an argument for a reduced requirement.
• Concerned that the targets set out in the policy are in addition to those in Policy HP2.

Policies HP4 (Residential Curtilages), HP5 (Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside) and HP6 (Rural Workers Accommodation in the Countryside) received a total of seven representations, of which four considered the Plan to be sound. One representor was concerned that the suggestion of the removal of permitted development rights within HP4 and HP5 does not conform to para. 206 of the NPPF and the need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances for such action.

HP7 provides for rural affordable housing to be built on “exception” sites. A total of nine representations have been received of which four are general comments and five relate to soundness, four of which consider the Plan to be unsound. Matters raised include:

• There is a need to define the “locality” to which the policy applies – the Rural Affordable Housing Needs Survey only disaggregates data to ward level. Need should be properly defined and distinguished from preference. Needs to be stringent control of development in the countryside.
• Need should relate to the nearest settlement.
• The policy in requiring 100% of rural exception housing to be affordable does not accord with the NPPF which allows for an element of market housing to support development viability.

HP8 sets the criteria by which applications for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation will be considered. The council received two representations, one supporting the policy, and one objecting to the policy due to the failure allocate land for Gypsy/Traveller provision contrary to evidence of need and in the face of a flawed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment.

HP9 establishes the policy requirements for Green Infrastructure (GI) in new residential developments. A total of eight representations have been received of which four are general comments and four relate to soundness, four of which consider the Plan to be unsound. Broadly, however, the policy was supported. Matters raised included the need for flexibility in the application of the policy to enable a development to respond to local circumstances, noting that some forms of GI may not be appropriate on a particular site. It was also commented that the GI evidence base should be brought up-to-date and that the council should be clear in the method for calculating off site financial contributions.

HP10 regarding houses in multiple occupation receive one representation seeking to ensure that landlords should adhere to strict criteria.
Economy

The economic policies received relatively few representations – 36 in total, of which 14 are general comments and 22 relate to soundness, of which 18 consider the Plan to be unsound. Three policies – EP10 (Equestrian Development), EP11 (Protection of Community Facilities in Rural Areas) and EP15 (Security Shutters) – received no representations.

In relation to EP1 (Employment Land Supply) Fylde council raised a number of detailed concerns amongst which is the view that the council has allocated an excess of employment land with questionable alignment between the amount and location of employment and housing growth, and methodological concerns about the evidence base.

Other matters raised by representors included:

- Concerned that Wyre is deliberately becoming a commuter area.
- Over-ambitious economic growth rates.
- Employment should be focused in the urban and rural areas based on the settlement hierarchy.
- There is a shortfall between allocated land and the objectively assessed employment need of 8.53ha.
- Allocations are at the upper end of forecasts and flexibility is therefore needed.
- Where the housing OAN is not being met it is perverse to prioritise employment in the allocation of employment land as part of mixed use allocation SA3/2. The evidence supporting this part of the allocation is old and therefore has questionable justification.

There were eight representations on policy EP2 (Existing Employment Areas) and EP3 (Existing Employment Sites), two general comments and six on soundness, of which four consider the Plan to be unsound. There was some support for the protection of existing employment areas however there was concern that the policies are unsound on the basis that they are narrowly focused on “B” use-class uses (and re-use) and do not allow for other employment generating uses – including leisure and retail – to be developed in existing employment areas or on existing employment sites. The policies are therefore viewed as rigid, overly restrictive and inflexible in this regard. Concern was also raised in relation to EP3 that a site may be vacant for such a length of time as to mean that it is no longer in employment use.

The single representation (general comment) made in relation to policy EP4 (Town, District and Local Centres) sought amendments to the boundary of Garstang Town Centre and the primary shopping area.
There were four representations regarding policy EP5 (Main Town Centre Uses). Three consider that the policy is unsound and not in compliance with the NPPF in its requirements in relation to the sequential assessment of alternative sites and the timescales attached to such, and the threshold for granting planning permission where an impact assessment is required. The need for an impact assessment where 500m² gross floorspace (comparison or convenience) is proposed in a town centre was also considered to be too low (i.e., a higher threshold should apply).

The single representation on policy EP6 concerning development in primary and secondary shopping frontages considers that the need to meet all of the criteria in part 1 of the policy to be unduly onerous and fails to promote a more flexible approach to retail policies.

There were two representations to policy EP7 (Local Convenience Stores). One considered that the maximum threshold of 400sq.m of gross internal floorspace for a local convenience store to be too low and inconsistent with the approach of policy EP5. The representation also considers that the policy should not be limited to sites within settlement boundaries and is restrictive in requiring a location in the vicinity of existing shops.

The council has received four, generally supportive, representations to policy EP8 (Rural Economy), however some representations consider that the policy should offer stronger protection to the character of the countryside and villages within it.

The council has received two representations to policy EP9 (Extensions to Holiday Accommodation) with one expressing concern that the policy is not permissive of the development of holiday accommodation.

The council has received five representations to policy EP12 (Renewable Energy). Matters raised include the need for the policy to explicitly reference the need for proposals to assess the impact on habitats, the open countryside and other sensitive parts of the environment.

The council has received three representations to policies EP13 (Telecommunications) and EP14 (Outdoor Advertisements and Directional Signs). The representation raise non-substantive matters.

**Site Allocations**

The site allocations section of the plan contains seven policies that allocate specific sites for development. A total of 320 representations have been received of which the majority – 220 – are in relation to housing allocations (under policy SA1). Overall, of the 320 representations 69 are general comments and 251 relate to soundness, of which 234 regard the Plan as unsound.
There were five representations made in relation to the chapter as a whole or its introductory paragraph, two of which are general comments and three relate to soundness all of which consider the plan to be unsound. Matters raised include:

- Question as to whether or not the Strategic Housing Land Availability Study 2017 rejected deliverable sites better placed in relation to the mitigation of highway impacts.
- The cumulative traffic impact of all sites allocated in certain areas should be carefully considered and evidenced as part of the highway evidence.
- The council has not identified and assessed the significant of any heritage assets that may be affected by proposed allocations.
- The council has not considered allocations within the context of the local ecological networks and the allocation policies do not address the specifics of maintenance, restoration, expansion, enhancement, reconnection, and creation of identified ecological networks.
- The need for a masterplan for sites of over 50 dwellings will add to costs and time delays that will hold back delivery.

Of the representations received, 23 promote a new residential site allocation. These have been logged as a representation in relation to policy SA1.

The council also received eight representations seeking to extend an allocation (i.e. to increase the size of the allocation) in relation to sites allocated under SA1 (residential development) and SA3 (mixed use development) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Reference</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA1/8</td>
<td>South of Blackpool Road, Poulton-le-Fylde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1/11</td>
<td>North of Norcross Lane, Norcross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1/13</td>
<td>Inskip Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1/16</td>
<td>West of Cockerham Road, Garstang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1/17</td>
<td>South of Prospect Farm, Garstang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1/21</td>
<td>Land South of Calder House Lane, Bowgreave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA3/3</td>
<td>Land West of Great Eccleston, Great Eccleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA3/4</td>
<td>Forton Extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy SA1 allocates land for residential development. Four representations have been received that are not specific to an allocation. All consider the Plan to be unsound. Matters raised include:

- Insufficient land allocated to meet the Objectively Assessed Need for Housing.
- No evidence that landholdings at Inskip owned by other landowners were given serious consideration.
- The process of site selection should be clearer that takes into account technical, social, economic and environmental factors and community engagement.
- No justification for the settlement boundary at Inskip.
- The employment element of mixed use allocation SA3/2 can be removed without materially affecting the employment land supply and instead should be allocated for residential use.

In terms of housing allocations made by the Local Plan under policy SA1, the majority of the total of 220 representations are in relation to SA1/13 – Inskip Extension which attracted 148 responses almost all of which are critical of the allocation, although there was support from the landowner. It should be noted that in addition there were also comments on other parts of the Plan that are based on the Inskip allocation. The council has produced a summary of the Inskip issues raised with the council’s response to each matter (see Appendix 16).

Through policy SA3, the council has allocated five sites for mixed use development, four of which are residential-led. The council has received 42 representations with regard to mixed use allocations, of which 15 are general comments and 27 relate to soundness, all of which consider the Plan to be unsound.

Many of the site allocated for residential or mixed use development through policies SA1 and SA3 lie on the edge of settlement boundaries in what is defined as countryside in the 1999 Wyre Local Plan. A number of these sites have a planning permission as of 31st March 2017 or have received a permission since. Many of the matters raised by those opposed to the Inskip allocation SA1/13 are echoed in the responses to other allocations. Within the mixed use allocations, 15 representations relate to SA3/4 – Forton Extension. Overall, the matters raised in relation to residential and mixed use allocations in the urban and rural parts of the borough includes the following:

- Lack of community engagement and lack of local support. No consultation with those home owners affected.
• Inappropriate/disproportionate scale of development proposed (particularly in relation to SA1/13 Inskip Extension and SA3/4 Forton Extension).

• Scale of growth unjustified by the evidence. The plan Objectively Assessed Housing Need should be based on latest government figures of 313 not 479pa.

• Over concentration of development in an already intensively developed urban peninsula. Significant strains on local infrastructure – e.g. roads, health and education.

• Highway constraints capable of being resolved in more sustainable locations such as the urban peninsula thus allowing development to be focused in more appropriate locations.

• Loss of rural and village character. Urbanisation of rural villages. Loss of rural village life.

• Unsustainable rural location – limited public transport service and/or lack of services and amenities.

• Building more houses will make existing problems with a lack of appropriate infrastructure – including highway infrastructure and Green Infrastructure - worse. More detailed infrastructure planning required. Development will add to existing congestion issues.

• Inappropriate local rural highway network for the scale of development proposed. No analysis of highway impact on rural roads undertaken.

• Loss of countryside.

• Loss of agricultural land – the council should prioritise the development of brownfield land.

• Some allocations are in areas at risk of flooding.

• Poor quality existing drainage systems – new development will make existing problems worse.

• The new houses will be unaffordable. Houses will be larger properties. The Plan does not accommodate the needs of the elderly.

• Limited housing demand in a rural/isolated location.

• Little employment in the area. Residential development will therefore increase commuting. Villages will become commuter suburbs.

• Development will adversely affect wildlife. This development would kill areas of biodiversity.

• The Local Plan takes a different approach to the distribution of development than that suggested by the Issues and Options strategy.

• Pollution will increase along with the carbon footprint. Will use more natural resources and increase waste. Negative impact on air quality. Negative impact on healthy lifestyles. Rural development doesn’t encourage walking or cycling.
• Unclear process of site selection. The three elements of sustainability have not been considered. Alternative sites in more sustainable locations not considered.
• The allocation will have a negative impact on house prices.
• The allocation is contrary to the NPPF. Various paragraphs referenced primarily dealing with the protection of the countryside/ habitats and the location of development in areas accessible by sustainable public transport options.
• The allocation is contrary to the local plan – for instance policies SP1 Development Strategy, CDMP4 Environmental Assets, SP4 Countryside Areas.
• Loss of Green Belt (SA1/8). Alternative sites should have been considered before proposing to release Green Belt for residential development. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated.
• Loss of recreation area/bowling green (SA3/4)
• Concerned that promised infrastructure will not be delivered.
• Development already coming forward in advance of a masterplan as required by the policy.

The draft Local Plan allocates four sites for employment development under policy SA2. The council received five representations in relation to these allocations, one general comment and four on soundness all of which consider the Plan to be unsound. All four of the soundness representations were from the CPRE. Matters raised include the loss of greenfield in relation to SA2/3 and the need to recognise the existence of Source Protection Zones in the Key Development Considerations (where relevant).

Policy SA4 allocates the Hillhouse Technology Enterprise Zone at Thornton for a range of uses including employment and residential. The council received eight representations in relation to this allocation, of which two are general comments and six relate to soundness, of which five consider the Plan to be unsound. Matters raised include:

• More development in Thornton will exacerbate existing deficiencies in the local infrastructure, including the highway network.
• Site includes flood zones 2 and 3. Risk of flooding.
• The site allocation does not mention that the site has high polluting previous uses which could affect controlled waters in an environmentally sensitive area.
• The Key Development Considerations do not include any reference of the need to protect neighbouring occupiers from potentially harmful uses.
• Part of the site which is of a different character to the remainder should be separated off for residential use.
• The requirement for a masterplan is contrary to the presumption in favour of sustainable development and could jeopardise delivery.
• No opportunity to comment on the progression of the plan since the Issues and Option stage – contrary to para. 157 and 182 of the NPPF.

Policy SA5 allocates the Port of Fleetwood for port related employment uses. The council received 10 representations, three of which are general comments and seven of which relate to soundness, of which six consider the Plan to be unsound. Of the 10 representations, six are from the landowner which whilst supporting the allocation in general consider it to be unsound on the ground of lack of flexibility in relation to the permissible uses and a concern that a number of requirements set out in the Key Development Considerations are unnecessary. Flood risk was raised as an issue in other representations.

Policy SA6 allocates a site at Garstang for Travelling Showpeople. This received three representations, all of which related to soundness, two of which consider the Plan to be unsound. Matters raised included the loss of countryside and a concern that the allocation is inappropriately located. There were two supporting representations.

Policy SA7 allocates a large area as an extension to the existing Brockholes Industrial Estate in Catterall. One representation was received – a general comment from the National Grid – noting a desire for building not to be constructed under overhead transmission lines.

The council has received two representations on the Monitoring chapter – one general comment and one considering the Plan unsound which seeks specific monitoring triggers to be included such that a failure to meet a target generates a clear response/action by the council. The general representation (from Historic England) considers that the indicators in relation to the historic environment to be deficient by neglecting to identify the need to monitor the state of heritage assets and neglecting the need to set targets for reducing assets at risk.

There was one generally supportive representation in relation to Appendix C on Car Parking Standards.

The council has received 53 representations that do not specifically reference a particular part of the Plan or policy. Of these, 22 are general comments and 31 are in relation to soundness. Of the latter, 20 consider the Plan to be sound whilst 11 consider the Plan to be unsound (one representation on soundness did not state whether or not the Plan is sound). Of these 11 representations four did not comment on the reason on the lack of soundness. Of the remaining seven responses the matters raised include:

• The Plan period should be re-based to 2014 to more accord with the evidence base.
• Housing demand calculations should be based on local information.
Infrastructure (education and health) funding needs to expand. Highways need be maintained.

Services cannot meet current needs.

More houses and cars will not preserve or enhance environmental sustainability.

Insufficient highway capacity and jobs to justify more development in Thornton.

The allocation at Inskip is not justified – Objectively Assessed Housing Need is too high; dispersal strategy based on highway constraints that can be resolved in more sustainable locations; Inskip is too small to be classed and lacking in infrastructure to be classed as a “Main Rural Settlement”.

The majority of the 22 making general comments raised similar issues to those identified in the above analysis of representations in relation to Local Plan policies. In addition, the following matters were raised:

- The Plan should include a Key Diagram.
- A housing trajectory should be provided for all residential allocations and residential major permitted sites.
- The Plan should recognise other constraints to development in Scorton other than the nature of the local highway network.

Finally, the council received a representation seeking a new policy on the protection of community cultural facilities.

**Evidence Base**

The local plan has been developed with, and supported by, an extensive evidence base. The council has received 14 representations relating to the evidence base (note that in some cases evidence base comments have been logged against a particular policy where this has been the main focus of a representation and will be accounted for in the above analysis of Local Plan representations). Comments were made against the following parts of the evidence base:

- Highway evidence
- Employment Land Study
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
- Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Housing Background Paper
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2)
- Green Belt Study
Sustainability Appraisal

The council has received 113 representations relating to the Sustainability Appraisal. Of these, 81 relate to residential allocation SA1/13 Inskip Extension. The vast majority of the Inskip representations are comments on the sustainability of the allocation rather than on the Sustainability Appraisal itself. Matters raised in relation to the SA include specific comments – particularly regarding scoring - in relation to individual sites, both allocated and non-allocated (including the treatment of alternative options). A number of respondents consider that the SA does not take sufficient regard of matters such as the implications of development on health care provision, heritage assets, open space provision and ecology. It was also commented that the SA is overly strategic and does not examine the implications of different growth options on a settlement by settlement basis and does not appraise the implications of the delivery of the “hybrid” approach taken by the Local Plan.

7. Planning for Infrastructure Delivery (IDP)

The Council has engaged with a variety of stakeholders and organisations as part of production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Regular meetings and phone calls have been held with partners and stakeholders to ensure the Local Plan is supported by infrastructure providers. The following organisations have been actively involved in the plan making process and fed into the IDP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Type</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>Highways England, Lancashire County Council, Fylde Borough Council, Blackpool Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway/Tramway</td>
<td>Network Rail, Blackpool Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Lancashire County Council, Blackpool Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>Lancashire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply</td>
<td>United Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste water</td>
<td>United Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk</td>
<td>Lancashire County Council, Environment Agency, United Utilities, Marine Management Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal change management</td>
<td>Lancashire County Council, Environment Agency, United Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>NHS England, Local GP Practices, Morecambe Bay CCG, Fylde &amp; Wyre CCG, Greater Preston CCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Lancashire County Council, Blackpool Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications/Broadband</td>
<td>BT Openreach, O2, Vodafone, Ericson, Three, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Lancashire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and minerals</td>
<td>Lancashire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency services</td>
<td>North West Ambulance Service, Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service, Lancashire Constabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space &amp; Sports facilities</td>
<td>Sports England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>National Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Electricity North West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Duty to Co-operate and Joint Working

**Duty to Cooperate (DTC)**

Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 inserted s33A into Part 2 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which introduced a duty on local planning authorities, county councils and other bodies with statutory functions to cooperate with each other on strategic planning matters. Accordingly, the council has worked closely with sub-regional and neighbouring local planning authorities, the county council and key service and infrastructure providers when preparing the evidence base and developing the Draft Local Plan. The council has prepared a separate statement on compliance with the Duty to Co-operate.

**Evidence Base – Joint Working**

The council has worked with a number of organisations to deliver a robust evidence base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Key Parties Involved</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land and Commercial Leisure Study 2012 and subsequent updates</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Discussed at a joint meeting of adjoining authorities (excepting Ribble Valley) on 5th July 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Regulation Assessment</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>Highways England Lancashire County Council Highways</td>
<td>Evidence was shared with the following adjacent local authorities – Blackpool, Preston, Lancaster, Fylde.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy, Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2014</td>
<td>Wyre council Blackpool council Fylde council</td>
<td>Commissioned by the three local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Key Parties Involved</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy, Traveller Accommodation Assessment Update 2016</td>
<td>Wyre council</td>
<td>An update assessment carried out as a consequence of revised government guidance (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackpool council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fylde council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Pitch Strategy</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Also involved consultation with the National Governing Bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Study 2011</td>
<td>Blackpool Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fylde Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Study 2013</td>
<td>Fylde Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (PHASE 2)</td>
<td>United Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancashire County Council as the Lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Flood Authority (LLFA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)</td>
<td>Wyre council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Addendum 1</td>
<td>Blackpool council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fylde council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Energy Review</td>
<td>Wyre council</td>
<td>Review of previous work undertaken by Lancashire County Council with a view to informing the need for additional evidence base work on wind energy supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackpool council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fylde council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Advisory Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Further Information

The following publicity and consultation material is available from the council’s web site at [www.wyre.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.wyre.gov.uk/localplan) or by contacting the Planning Policy Team at Wyre Council, Civic Centre, Breck Road, Poulton-le-Fylde, FY6 7PU. (e-mail – planning.policy@wyre.gov.uk).

Appendix 3 Call for Sites 2012 Publicity and Consultation Material

- Public Notice
- Consultee letter
- Letter to Wyre councillors
- Response form
- Guidance note
- Draft site assessment methodology
- Draft site assessment methodology comment form
Appendix 4 Call for Sites 2014 Publicity and Consultation Material

- Public Notice
- Consultee letter
- Letter to Wyre councillors
- Letter to Wyre parish and town councils
- Response form
- Guidance note

Appendix 5 Call for Sites 2015 Publicity and Consultation Material

- Public Notice
- Consultee letter
- Letter to Wyre councillors
- Letter to Wyre parish and town councils
- Response form
- Guidance note

Appendix 6 Issues and Options 2015 Publicity and Consultation Material

- Public notice
- Consultation letter
- Response form
- Summary document
- Leaflet
- Poster
- Exhibition board material
- Summary document
- News Article – Wyre council web site

Appendix 11 Issues and Options 2015 – Local Plan Briefing 2016

- e-mail/letter wording
- Briefing
- Questions and Answers
- Article on Wyre Council web site
- Community e-news screen shot
Appendix 12 – Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 – Publicity and Consultation Material

1. Public notice
2. Consultation letter
3. Statement of Representations Procedure and Availability of Documents
4. Response form
5. Response form guidance note
6. Leaflet/poster
7. Press release
8. Wyre council web site article
9. Wyre Voice Autumn 2017 article
10. Wyre Engagement Network September 2017
11. Wyre e-news October 2017
12. Wyred Up – e-mail September 2017
13. Wyre council Facebook page

Appendices available as separate documents

The following appendices are available as separate documents (for the submission of the local plan some documents have been merged):

Appendix 3 – Call for Sites 2012 publicity and consultation material
Appendix 4 - Call for Sites 2014 publicity and consultation material
Appendix 5 - Call for Sites 2015 publicity and consultation material
Appendix 6 – Issues and Options 2015 publicity and consultation material
Appendix 7a – 7h – Issues and Options 2015 Main Matters Raised by Question
Appendix 9 – Issues and Options 2015 Main Matters – Local Plan/Further Response
Appendix 10 – Issues and Options 2015 – Specific Site Comments and Local Plan Response
Appendix 12 – Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 – Publicity and Consultation Material
Appendix 14 – Summary of Responses to the Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017
Appendix 15 - Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) and Housing Supply – Summary of Main Matters and Wyre Council Response
Appendix 17 - Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 – Highway Matters - Summary of Main Matters and Lancashire County Council Response

Appendix 18 - Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 – Viability Study – Summary of Main Matters and Keppie Massie Response
Appendix 1 - The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (extract)

Preparation of a local plan

18.—(1) A local planning authority must—

(a) notify each of the bodies or persons specified in paragraph (2) of the subject of a local plan which the local planning authority propose to prepare, and

(b) invite each of them to make representations to the local planning authority about what a local plan with that subject ought to contain.

(2) The bodies or persons referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(a) such of the specific consultation bodies as the local planning authority consider may have an interest in the subject of the proposed local plan;

(b) such of the general consultation bodies as the local planning authority consider appropriate; and

(c) such residents or other persons carrying on business in the local planning authority’s area from which the local planning authority consider it appropriate to invite representations.

(3) In preparing the local plan, the local planning authority must take into account any representation made to them in response to invitations under paragraph (1).

19. Before submitting a local plan to the Secretary of State under section 20 of the Act, the local planning authority must—

(a) make a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available in accordance with regulation 35, and

(b) ensure that a statement of the representations procedure and a statement of the fact that the proposed submission documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected, is sent to each of the general consultation bodies and each of the specific consultation bodies invited to make representations under regulation 18(1).
Representations relating to a local plan

20.—(1) Any person may make representations to a local planning authority about a local plan which the local planning authority propose to submit to the Secretary of State.

(2) Any such representations must be received by the local planning authority by the date specified in the statement of the representations procedure.

(3) Nothing in this regulation applies to representations taken to have been made as mentioned in section 24(7) of the Act.

Submission of documents and information to the Secretary of State

22.—(1) The documents prescribed for the purposes of section 20(3) of the Act are—

(a) the sustainability appraisal report;

(b) a submission policies map if the adoption of the local plan would result in changes to the adopted policies map;

(c) a statement setting out—

(i) which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18,

(ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18,

(iii) a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18,

(iv) how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account;

(v) if representations were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations; and

(vi) if no representations were made in regulation 20, that no such representations were made;

(d) copies of any representations made in accordance with regulation 20; and

(e) such supporting documents as in the opinion of the local planning authority are relevant to the preparation of the local plan.
(2) Notwithstanding regulation 3(1), each of the documents referred to in paragraph (1) must be sent in paper form and a copy sent electronically.

(3) As soon as reasonably practicable after a local planning authority submit a local plan to the Secretary of State they must—

(a) make available in accordance with regulation 35—

23. Before the person appointed to carry out the independent examination under section 20 of the Act makes a recommendation under section 20(7), (7A) or (7C)(1) of the Act the person must consider any representations made in accordance with regulation 20.

(i) a copy of the local plan;

(ii) a copy of each of the documents referred to in paragraph (1)(a), (b) and (c);

(iii) any of the documents referred to in paragraph (1)(d) or (e) which it is practicable to so make available, and

(iv) a statement of the fact that the documents referred to in sub-paragraphs (i) to (iii) are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected;

(b) send to each of the general consultation bodies and each of the specific consultation bodies which were invited to make representations under regulation 18(1), notification that the documents referred to in paragraphs (a)(i) to (iii) are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected; and

(c) give notice to those persons who requested to be notified of the submission of the local plan to the Secretary of State that it has been so submitted.
Appendix 2 Statement of Community Involvement Position Statement

1. Introduction

The purpose of this note is to summarise the changes to the legislation and regulations which have occurred since the Revised SCI of 2010 was adopted, and the impacts for how the Local Plan has been prepared.

2. When and how the Council consults

Section 4 of the adopted Revised SCI sets out when the Council will consult in the preparation of documents that make up the Local Development Framework (LDF) and sets out the methods by which consultation will take place. The terminology of LDF is no longer the correct expression following the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the revised regulations (2012) which now utilises the term “Local Plan”.

The SCI refers to several stages in the preparation of a Development Plan Document (Local Plan), as follows:

- Pre-production, evidence gathering and Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
- Consultation on the preparation of the Development Plan Document “options and preferred options” (Regulation 25)
- Proposed submission version of DPD published (Regulation 27 and 28)
- Examination by Planning Inspector (Regulation 34)

These stages were in line with the regulations which applied at that time (the 2004 Regulations as amended in 2008 and 2009). Changes to regulations in 2012 have altered these steps in the production of a local plan. The stages now required, as set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 are:

- Preparation of a Local Plan (Regulation 18)
- Publication of a Local Plan (Regulation 19)
- Submission of documents and information to the Secretary of State (Regulation 22)
- Independent examination (Regulation 24)
- Adoption of a local plan (Regulation 26)

There are no major changes to the procedure of producing a Local Plan between the Revised SCI (based on the 2004 Regulations as amended in 2008 and 2009) and the new 2012 Regulations. Regulations 25 and 27 from the amended 2004 Regulations have in effect become have become regulations 18 and 19 in the 2012 Regulations.

For the Wyre Local Plan, the Issues and Options document was the subject of formal consultation during the summer of 2015. Further targeted engagement with key stakeholders was undertaken over 2016 an 2017 in the form of meetings with statutory
consultees and engagement with parish and town councils. This approach to engagement was driven by the need to understand and explain the variety of constraints faced in Wyre.

Further details are provided in the Statement of Consultation on the full range of engagement which has taken place under Regulation 18. As noted in the SCI Table 3 it may not always be necessary to carry out public consultation on both “issues and options” and “preferred options”. In this instance it was not considered necessary to carry out a preferred options consultation. This is primarily due to the restrictive constraints that drive the final Development Strategy.

3. Who the Council consults (consultation bodies)

Paragraph 4.5 – 4.10 of Section 4 of the adopted SCI sets out whom the Council consults in the preparation of the Local Plan. This section appears to suggest that this list is publicly available, however this is not the case due to current data protection legislation. Appendix B of the SCI contains a list of the specific and general consultation bodies that are likely to be consulted. It is intended for illustrative purposes and is noted as being not exhaustive and under constant review.

Since the SCI was adopted, there have been a number of changes to the consultation bodies as listed in Appendix B of the SCI. New bodies have been added, some no longer exist, and others are out of date and exist under a different title.

The Council ensures that the requirements for notifying specific and general consultation bodies at various stages in the preparation of the local plan are achieved in accordance with the 2012 Regulations. Specific and general consultation bodies are those listed under Regulation 2 of the 2012 Regulations, and summarised below.

Specific consultation bodies means the following:

- The Coal Authority
- The Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- The Marine Management Organisation
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- The Highways Agency
- Adjoining local authorities
- Relevant telecommunications companies
- Relevant health providers
- Relevant gas and electricity companies
- Relevant water and sewerage undertakers
- Homes and Communities Agency
General consultation bodies means the following:

- Voluntary bodies in the area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of local business.
Statement of Consultation

Appendix 8 – Bodies and Organisations Consulted at Issues and Options (Regulation 18) Stage, 2015

This appendix lists in alphabetical order those bodies and organisations listed in the Local Plan consultation database and consulted as part of the publication of the Issues and Options document in July 2015.

A & M Seafoods Limited
A.C.E.R.T.
Abbeyfield Society Garstang & District
Accertgroup Housing Association
Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd
Action for Better Access
Addison Engineering Co Limited
Addison Project PLC
Adlington
AFA Associates Specialist Planning Services Ltd
AFA Planning Ltd
Age Concern
Age Concern Preston & South Ribble
AH Medical Properties Plc.
Airport Operators Association
Alan Jones Chartered Surveyors
Alliance Rail (Great North Western Railway Co Ltd)
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK Ltd
Ancient Monuments Society
Appledwaiite Ltd
Area Dean of Poulton Deanery
Armitstead Barnett
Arthritis Care
Associated British Ports
Atkins Global
Atkins Planning Consultants
Autism Initiatives
B E Group
Baines School
Barnacre with Bonds Parish Council
Barratt Manchester
Barrow Borough Council
Barton Grange
Barton Parish Council
Barton Willmore
Barton Willmore (Leeds)
Baxter H Construction Ltd
Bay Business Centre
BBD
BE Group
Beechwood Surgery
Bell Ingram Design
Bellway Homes Ltd (North West Division)
Berrys
Bill Atkinson Associates
Bilsborrow Post Office
Blackpool & Fylde College
Blackpool Bay Area Co.
Blackpool Borough Council
Blackpool North & Fleetwood Conservative Association
Blackpool Sixth Form College
Blackpool Transport Services Limited
Blackpool, Wyre & Fylde Health Services NHS Trust
Bleasdale Parish Council
BNP Paribas Real Estate
Bovis Homes Limited
Bowgreave & Bonds Residents Association
Bowlan Forest High Parish Council
Bowsall Ltd
Bradshaws Hamer Park & Howarth
Breck Primary School
British Chambers of Commerce
British Geological Survey
British Waterways
Broadwater Sub Post Office
Broadway Malyan
Broadway Post Office
Bromley Parker Architects
Business Forum
C & G Neve Limited
C A Planning & Cassidy & Ashton Group Ltd
Cabus Parish Council
Cala Gran Caravan Park
Caldecotte Consultants
Campaign for Real Ale
Camping & Caravan Club
Canal & River Trust / Glandwr Cymru
Caravan Club
Cardinal Allen Catholic High School
Care and Lifestyle Villages Ltd
Carleton Green Community Primary School
Carr Head Primary School
Castle Lane Community Centre
Catterall Parish Council

66
CBI (North West Office)
CBRE
Centrica PLC
Charles F Jones & Son
Charles Saer Community Primary School
Chatsworth Avenue Post Office
Chatsworth Library
Chaucer Primary School
Chemical Business Association
Chipping Parish Council
Chris Hewitt Architects Ltd
Church Commissioners for England
Churches Together
Churches Together in Thornton
Citizens Advice Bureau
CL Planning
Claufton & Bleasdale Residents Association (CABRA)
Claughton Parish Council
Cleveleys Association of Commerce & Trade
Cleveleys Community Centre
Cleveleys Health Centre
Cleveleys Library
Cleveleys Post Office
Coastal Construction Ltd
Coba Hair Ltd
Cockerham Parish Council
Colliers CRE
Colliers International
Commission for Rural Communities
Community Futures
Connect Young Peoples Centre
Connexions Lancashire
Corporate Property Group
Council for British Archaeology
Country Land & Business Association
CPRE
CPRE Lancashire Branch
CPRE Wyre District Group
Croft Goode Partnership
Crown Marine Estates
Cunningham Planning
Darbyshire & Horabin Ltd T/a DCL Transport Services
David Halsall International Limited
David Hill Property Consultants
David Wilson Homes North West
De Pol Associates Ltd
Deaf Society B F & W
Department for Culture Media & Sport
Department for Transport
Department of Trade and Industry, Environment Division
Department of Transport, Rail Group
DfT Rail Regional Policy & Delivery
Dialogue
Dickinson Dees
Dickman Associates Ltd
Diocesan Board of Finance
Disability First
Disability Rights Commission
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
Dolphin Land & Development Consultancy Ltd
Dowd Town Planning
DPDS Consulting
Dpp One Ltd
Dransfield Properties Limited
Drivers Jonas Deloitte
Drs Dempsey & Cook
DTZ
DWP Estates
E.ON Registered Office
Eden Land & Development
Electricity North West Limited (ENW)
Ellel Parish Council
Elswick Parish Council
Emmanuel Church
English Heritage
English Partnerships
Environment Agency
Essar Oil UK (formerly Shell UK Ltd)
Euan Kellie Property Solutions
F E P Axxicon Limited
Face to Face Fylde Coast YMCA
Fairhurst
Fields in Trust (Prev National Playing Fields Association)
Firth Associates (RIBA Architects)
Firth Associates
Fleetwood Chamber of Trade & Commerce
Fleetwood Civic Society
Fleetwood Community Centre
Fleetwood Development Partnership
Fleetwood Development Trust
Fleetwood Fish Forum
Fleetwood Fisherman Association
Fleetwood Health Centre
Fleetwood High School
Fleetwood Hospital
Fleetwood Leisure Centre
Fleetwood Library
Bodies and Organisations Consulted at Issues and Options (Regulation 18) Stage, July 2015

Fleetwood Licensees Forum
Fleetwood Post Office
Fleetwood Regeneration and Energy Enterprise 07
Fleetwood Town Council
Fleetwood Town Football Club
Fletcher Smith Architects
Forest of Bowland AONB
Forestry Commission
Forestry Commission, North West England
Forton Parish Council
Forton Post Office
Fox Planning Consultancy
FPD Savills, International Property Consultants
Framptons
Freeport Fleetwood
Freight Transport Association
Friends of the Earth
Fusion on Line Limited
Futurama Ltd
FVP
Fylde & Wyre Child Care Team
Fylde & Wyre Clinical Commissioning Group
Fylde Architects & Surveyors
Fylde Bird Club
Fylde Borough Council
Fylde Coast Bridleways Association
Fylde Coast Hindu Society
Fylde Coast Model Flying Association
Fylde Design Associates
Fylde Naturalists Society
G Carter & Son (Thornton) UK
G L Hearn
Garden History Society
Garstang & District Ramblers Association
Garstang Area Action Group
Garstang Area Partnership
Garstang Chamber of Trade & Commerce
Garstang Community Academy
Garstang Community Primary School
Garstang Leisure Centre
Garstang Library
Garstang Medical Centre
Garstang MENCAP
Garstang Post Office
Garstang St Thomas’ CE Primary School
Garstang Town Council
Garstang Town Trust
GASTRA
Gerald Eve
Gladman Developments
Goosnargh Parish Council
Gova Northern Ltd
Graham Anthony Associates
Great Eccleston Post Office
Great Eccleston Village Centre
Gt Eccleston Parish Council
GVA
Gypsy & Traveller Law Reform Coalition
H.M. Coastguard
Halcrow Group Limited
Hambleton Parish Council
Hambleton Post Office
Hambleton Primary Academy
Hard of Hearing Club
Harrison Pitt
Harrison, Willis & Moore
Health & Safety Executive
Heritage Trust for the North West
Higham & Co
Highways England
Hodderway Post Office
Hodgson High School Technology College
Home Builders Federation Ltd
Homes & Communities Agency (Manchester)
Hourigan Connolly
Housing Corporation (North)
How Commercial Planning Advisers
How Planning
Howard Sharp & Partners LLP
Hunters Land Rover
Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd (“3”)
ICI Chemicals & Polymers Ltd
Independent Energy UK Ltd
Ingle’s Dawndew Salad Ltd
Inland Waterways Association
Inskip St Peter’s C of E (Aided) Primary School
Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council
Institute of Directors North West
Janet Dixon Town Planners Ltd
Jennifer Lamport associates Ltd
JMP Consulting
John Shaw Engineering
Jones Day
Jones Homes (Fylde)
Jones Lang LaSalle Limited
JPCC Chartered Town Planners
Bodies and Organisations Consulted at Issues and Options (Regulation 18) Stage, July 2015

JWPC
Kensington Developments Ltd
Keystone Design Associates Ltd
Keyworker Homes (NW)
Kirkland Parish Council
Kirkwells Planning & Sustainability Consultants
Knights LLP
Knott End Library
Knott End Post Office
Knott End Squash Club & Leisure Centre
Lambert Smith Hampton
Lancashire Archaeological Society
Lancashire Association of Local Councils Wyre Area
Lancashire Badger Group
Lancashire Care NHS Trust
Lancashire Constabulary
Lancashire Constabulary, Fleetwood Police Station
Lancashire Constabulary, Crime Reduction Unit,
Lancashire County Council (Archaeological Services)
Lancashire County Council (Children & Young People)
Lancashire County Council Highways
Lancashire County Council Planning
Lancashire County Council Policy & Public Transport
Lancashire County Council Traveller Education Services
Lancashire County Council Youth & Community
Lancashire County Council, Environment Directorate
Lancashire County Council, Property Group
Lancashire County Developments Limited
Lancashire County Museum Service
Lancashire Economic Partnership
Lancashire Enterprise Partnership
Lancashire Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group
Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service
Lancashire Mind Ltd
Lancashire Playing Fields Association
Lancashire Police
Lancashire RIGS Geodiversity Group
Lancashire Youth & Community Service for Fylde & Wyre
Lancashire Youth Offending Team
Lancaster & Wyre Conservative Association
Lancaster Canal Trust
Lancaster City Council
Larkholme Primary School
Leonard Cheshire Disability
Lidl UK GmbH
Linag O’Rourke

Little Eccleston with Larbreck Parish Council
Lockwood Avenue Surgery
Lofthouse of Fleetwood Limited
Lupus Support Group BF&W
M L Planning Consultancy Ltd
MacKeith Dickinson
Manor Beach Primary School
Maple Timber Systems Ltd
Marine Management Organisation
Marketing Lancashire
McAteer Associates Ltd
McKee School
Mellor Architects
Methodist Church
Methodist Church (North Lancs District)
Methodist Churches
Midgley Drawing Services
Miller Homes
Millfield Science & Performing Arts College
Milton Youth & Community Centre
Ministry of Defence
Mobile Operators Association
Mono Consultants Ltd
Morecambe Bay Partnership
Morris Homes (North) Limited
Mosaic Town Planning
Mount View Practice
Muir Housing Association
Murbrook Chartered Surveyors
Myerscough & Bilsborrow Parish Council
Myerscough College
Nateby Parish Council
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
National Air Traffic Services Limited
National Farmers Union - North West Region
National Grid
Natural England
Neighbourhood Watch
Nether Wyresdale Parish Council
Network Rail
New Era Housing Association
New Fylde Housing
NFU Mutual Branch
NHS North Lancashire
NJL Consulting
Normoss Road Post Office
North & West Lancashire Learning Partnership
North & Western Lancashire Chamber of Commerce
North British Housing Association
North Lancashire Primary Care Trust
North Lancashire Teaching PCT
North West Ambulance Service
North West Development Agency
North West Lancs Cyclists Touring Club
North West Planning Aid
North West Regional Leaders Board
North West Strategic Health Authority
North West Water
North West Waterways Canal & River Trust
Northern Express Glass Limited
Northern Rail Limited
Northern Trust
NPL Estates Ltd
Npower
Npower Renewables
NTJ Design
NVision
NW Planning Aid
Objective Corporation
Old Peoples Welfare Association
Orvia
Out Rawcliffe Parish Council
Over 60s Club
Over Wyre Sports Centre
Over Wyresdale Parish Council
Overton Parish Council
P Wilson & Company Chartered Surveyors
Parish of St Andrews
Paul Dickinson & Associates
Peacock & Smith
Persimmon Homes Lancashire
Persimmon PLC
Peter Brett Associates
Pilling memorial Hall Trustees
Pilling Parish Council
Pilling Post Office
PIP
Pipecraft Ltd
Planning Inspectorate
Planning Potential
Planning Problems Solved
Planning Prospects Ltd
Plantasia
Planware Ltd
Plot of Gold Limited
Post Office Ltd
Poulton & Wyre Rail Society
Poulton Action Group
Poulton Community & Youth Centre
Poulton Historical & Civic Society
Poulton Library
Poulton Post Office
Poulton St Chads CE primary School
Poulton Swimming & Fitness Centre
Poulton-le-Fylde Clinic
Poulton-le-Fylde Licensees Forum
Powergen
PRDS
Preesall Town Council
Preston City Council
Queensway Medical Centre
Raby Contract Services
Racial Equality Council
Rail Freight Group
Ramblers Association
Rapleys
Redrow Homes Ltd
Refurb (Wyre & Fylde) Ltd
Renewable UK
Residential Parks Limited
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Riversway Developments Ltd
Road Haulage Association (Northern)
Road Haulage Association Ltd
Robert Lobell
Rossall School
Royal British Legion Fleetwood Branch
Royal British Legion Garstang Branch
Royal British Legion Thornton Cleveleys Branch
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (Wyre)
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds England
RPS
Rural Forum
Rural Solutions
Russell Armer Limited
Russell Homes
Sainsburys
Sanderson Weatherall
Scorton Church of England Primary School
Scorton Ministers Meeting
Scorton Post Office
Secretary of State for Transport
Bodies and Organisations Consulted at Issues and Options (Regulation 18) Stage, July 2015

Sedgwick Associates
Senior Citizens Association
Shakespeare Monofilament UK
Shelter Lancashire (Blackburn)
Shepherd Planning
Simmons Construction
Singleton Parish Council
Smiths Gore
Social Enterprise Solutions
Sport England (North West Region)
SSA Planning Ltd
St Aidans Church of England Technology College
St Hilda’s Church of England Primary School
St John the Evangelist R C Church
St John’s Catholic Primary School
St Mary & St Michael Catholic Primary School
St Mary’s Catholic Primary School
St Wulstan & St Edmund Catholic Parishes
Stagecoach North West Ltd
Staining Parish Council
Stakepool Post Office
Stalmine Post Office
Stalmine with Staynall Parish Council
Steven Abbott Associates
Story Homes
String Computer Systems Ltd
Strutt & Parker
Sure Start
T.S.D. Jones
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
Telewest Broadband Communications
Tenant Farmers Association
The Churchtown Society
The Crown Estate
The Emerson Group
The Georgian Group
The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
The National Notice Handling Centre (NNHC)
The Packaged Ice Company Limited
The Planning Bureau Limited
The Ponds for People Conservation Trust
The Post Office
The Post Office, 201 Park Lane
The Post Office, 662 North Drive
The Post Office, 93 Victoria Road West
The Post Office, Longmoor Lane
The Showmens Guild of Great Britain
The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
The Theatres Trust
The Twentieth Century Society
The Victorian Society
The Village Practice, Thornton Medical Centre
The Wildlife Trust
The Woodland Trust
Thompson Developments
Thornton & Little Thornton Covenant of Churches
Thornton Action Group
Thornton Cleveleys & Poulton Forum
Thornton Cleveleys Association of Commerce & Trade
Thornton Cleveleys Sports Centre
Thornton East Post Office
Thornton Library
Thornton Life Long Learning
Thornton Post Office
Thurnham Parish Council
T-Mobile (UK) Limited
Transpennine Express
Treales, Roseacre & Wharles Parish Council
Tribal
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
Turley Associates
Turner Builders Ltd
Ultimate Green Energy
United Co-Operatives Limited
United Utilities PLC
Upper Rawcliffe with Tarnacre Parish Council
Vernon & Co
Victrix Technology Centre
Vinnolit Hillhouse Ltd
Virgin Mobile
Virgin Trains
Vision Land & Proprty
Vodafone Group Limited
Walker Morris
Walton & Co
Warren Farm Community Association
Waters Reach Residents Association
WC & J Fowler & Son
West View Health Village
Westview Community Association
Wildlife Trust (National)
Wilkinson Developments
Winmarleigh Church of England Primary School
Winmarleigh Parish Council
Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC
Women’s Aid
Women's National Commission
Woodford Land (North West)
Woodplumpton Parish Council
Wray with Botton Parish Council
WYG Planning & Environment
Wyre Area Road Safety Committee
Wyre Congregations of Jehovah's Witnesses
Wyre District Youth Council
Wyre Drug Project
Wyre Housing Association
Wyre Power / Carron Energy
Wyre Seniors
Wyresdale Park Estates
YMCA
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Local Plan Briefing Note 2106

E-mail and Letter wording

Dear Consultee,

As you are aware the Council is preparing a new Wyre Local Plan for the period 2011 to 2031. We are aware that since last summer 2015 when the Council consulted on Issues and Options, there hasn’t been any further communication with regards to the Local Plan. A lot of progress has been made and therefore an update Briefing Note has been prepared for your information. A Questions and Answers sheet which explains some technical aspects of the process has also been prepared.

Both the Briefing Note and the Questions and Answers sheet are also available on the Council’s website.

Yours sincerely

Rea Psillidou
Planning Policy and Economic Development Manager
Wyre Local Plan

Briefing August 2016

The new Local Plan is at its preparatory stage (Regulation 18 stage). In summer 2015 the Council consulted on Issues and Options for the Local Plan. The purpose of this briefing is to provide an update on Local Plan progress.

2015 Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

In total 760 individual responses were received during the consultation on the Issues and Options Document. This has been a very good response and has provided a lot of valuable information about people’s concerns.


All the responses have been read and the issues raised are being addressed in the preparation of the local plan. The main matters raised included

- Inadequate infrastructure (including highways, schools, doctors, drainage) to support development;
- There is no need for further housing questioning the SHMA methodology
- Lack of employment to support the increased population
- Need for a mix of housing including affordable housing and housing for the elderly
- Further Green Belt should be designated around rural settlements

A Council response to the main matters is available on the Council’s website at www.wyre.gov.uk/issuesandoptions2015/mainmatters. A comprehensive report on the consultation on the Issues and Option document including a Council response to the individual comments will be published with the final draft Local Plan.

Local Development Scheme (LDS)

On the 7th of July 2016 the Council approved a revised LDS which is available on the Council’s website at - http://www.wyre.gov.uk/info/200317/planning_policy/425/local_development_scheme

It was necessary to revise the timetable and work programme in order to speed up the process. Although there will not be another consultation this summer, there will be an opportunity to comment on the draft plan before it is submitted to Secretary of State for examination.

All the comments received at that stage will also be sent to the Inspector together with the Local Plan and all supporting evidence.

To assist with comments on the draft plan the Council will be publishing pieces of evidence as they are completed to enable people to examine and understand the evidence shaping the Local Plan prior to being consulted on the draft Local Plan. It is worth checking periodically for new evidence published on the website at – http://www.wyre.gov.uk/info/200318/evidence_base
Local Plan Evidence

The Council has continued to work on the evidence which is informing the Local Plan. The evidence is being made available on the Council's website as it is being completed. Since last summer the following pieces of evidence have been published –

- Employment Land Study Update and Addendum
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Addendums 1 and 2
- Rural Housing Needs Assessment
- Green Belt Study

The Council is currently working on the following pieces of evidence –

- Capacity on the highways network. This is being progressed with the local highway authority – Lancashire County Council (LCC) and Highways England (HE) and will also identify deliverable improvements to the network to support future growth.
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, (SFRA) Level II which considers flooding from all sources as well as the existence of flood defences to establish level of risk and necessary mitigation.
- Settlements Study
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)
- Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTAA) Update
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This is a joint work with infrastructure and service providers including the local education authority and health providers, to establish what additional infrastructure is needed to support growth.
- Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Local Plan Viability. This will establish whether the Local Plan is financially deliverable.

Emerging Local Plan

The evidence for the housing need to be addressed in the Local Plan is found in the 2013 Joint Fylde Coast Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which was published early 2014 and Addendums I and II which were published earlier this year.

Addendums I and II to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment update the 2013 SHMA with regards to the 2012 population and household projections and takes account of the Employment Land Study Update. The evidence shows that the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) is between 400 - 479 dwellings a year for the Plan period of 2011 - 2031. The consultants and the Council's legal advisor recommended that the Local Plan should make adopt an OAN figure at the upper end of the range.

The Council accepted the recommendation and approved as the OAN figure 479 dwellings per annum which aligns with the economic evidence as required by national policy and guidance. This is the number of dwellings that the Local Plan is required to deliver. However the actual number that the Local Plan can deliver may be lower depending on the extent of constraints including highway capacity and flood risk. If the Local Plan does not make provision for the full OAN figure it needs robust evidence to justify that position, otherwise it will fail at examination. The Council must demonstrate that it has explored all options to make provision for the full OAN figure.

Flood risk and highways capacity are two main constraints which influence what can be delivered in the Local Plan. The Council has been working for over a year with LCC and Highways England (HE) on highways evidence. In order to establish the amount of housing that can be delivered further detailed modelling is needed which cannot start until September when the schools are back. It is also necessary to have the detail design of the proposed
Little Singleton by-pass later in the year in order to establish the capacity on the A585. He will be consulting on options for the scheme in September.

Consultation Database

The Council has just completed a refresh of the Local Plan consultee's database. If you have not recently filled in a form to be on the database and you would like to be on the database please follow the link below to the database application form.

www.wyre.gov.uk/localplan/database.
Wyre Local Plan

Question and Answers

August 2016

What is a Local Plan?

The Local Plan is a policy document which shows how the Borough will develop and change over a fifteen year period to meet the needs of the community and businesses.

It identifies land for development such as housing and employment and also designates areas where development is controlled such as areas of countryside and Green Belt.

Once adopted the Local Plan becomes formal council policy and is used to determine planning applications. The law requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the up-to-date adopted Local Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

Why is the Council preparing a Local Plan?

All councils are legally required to prepare and maintain an up-to-date "Local Plan" to guide future development over a 15 year period.

The Local Plan provides certainty to communities and developers with regards to where and how development should take place.

What period will the new Local Plan cover?

When adopted, the new Local Plan will cover the period from 2011 to 2031.

What will happen to the existing Local Plan?

Currently the relevant Local Plan is the Wyre Borough Local Plan adopted in 1999. Some of the policies expired on 27 September 2007 but many were saved and they are still relevant to the consideration of any planning application.

In addition in 2009 the Council adopted the Fleetwood and Thornton Area Action Plan (AAP), covering a specific area extending from Fleetwood docks to Stanah. Policies in the AAP are used in the determination of planning applications within the area covered by the AAP.

When the new Local Plan is adopted it will replace both the Wyre Borough Local Plan adopted in 1999 and the Fleetwood and Thornton Area Action Plan adopted in 2009.
Is there a set process for preparing the Local Plan?

The Local Plan is prepared in accordance with procedures set out in Planning Regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>Process Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation 18</td>
<td>A period of ongoing informal consultation and engagement seeking to identify the key issues to be addressed and consider all reasonable alternatives for dealing with these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation 19</td>
<td>'Publication' stage – a formal six-week public consultation to consider what the Council believes to be the 'final' version of the Local Plan before it is submitted for examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations 22</td>
<td>The Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State together with the evidence supporting it and all the comments received during the consultation at Regulation 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations 24</td>
<td>Independent examination. The Secretary of State appoints an Inspector who will examine the Local Plan passes the 'soundness' tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Positively prepared – the plan meets objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Justified - it is the most appropriate strategy against reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Effective – it is deliverable over its period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Consistent with national policy – the plan enables the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with national policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After the examination the Inspector will report to the Council on his findings. The Council can only adopt the Local Plan if it is found 'sound'. The Inspector may recommend modifications to the Local Plan to make it sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation 26</td>
<td>Document adopted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is a Local Development Scheme?

All councils are required to prepare a Local Development Scheme (LDS). The LDS is essentially the project plan for the preparation of the Local Plan and sets out a timetable for its preparation including expected dates for consultation, the independent examination and adoption of the local plan.

What is the ‘Evidence Base’?

Policies and proposals in the Local Plan must be ‘justified’ on the basis of robust evidence. The Local Plan’s evidence base consists of documents relating to among other things employment, retail and housing. This evidence base is constantly being added to and updated as the plan preparation progresses.

It is advisable to periodically check for new documents published on the website at http://www.wyre.gov.uk/info/200318/evidence_base
What is the ‘Consultation Database’?

The ‘Consultation Database’ is a database of persons and organisation with interest in the Local Plan. It is used to contact people at different stages of the Local Plan process such as when a document is published for consultation.

You can add your details on the database at www.wyre.gov.uk/localplan/database.
Update on Wyre's Local Plan

Published Monday, 22 August 2016

Find out about progress on our plan for future development across the borough.

Last summer the council consulted on Issues and Options for the Local Plan, which sets out how the borough will develop physically over a fifteen year period to meet the needs of the community and businesses.

In total 760 individual responses were received during the consultation on the Issues and Options document, which considered how best to meet the demands of an increasing population and provide suitable housing, employment and infrastructure.

All the responses have been read and the issues raised are being addressed in the preparation of the local plan.

We’ve now produced a briefing note to bring you up-to-date on progress of the plan since the consultation and the next steps of the process.

Not sure what the local plan is? Find the answer to this and other frequently asked questions here

More information is available at wyre.gov.uk/localplan
Welcome to Wyre Council's community e-news

Grants available for flooding victims
If you were affected by last winter's floods and haven't had a flood resilience grant, apply now. Read more

Heritage open days
Wyre is hosting a series of special activities to celebrate Heritage open days 2016. Read more

YMCA Garstang leisure centre
Improvements are still in progress for the revamp of the leisure centre and swimming pool at Garstang. Read more

Look out for Wyre Voice
Wyre Voice will be coming through your door this month. You can also pick up a copy from a number of locations or read it online.

Update on Wyre's local plan
Find out about progress on our plan for future development across the borough. Read more

Snow White & The Seven Dwarfs at the Marine Hall
Snow White & The Seven Dwarfs comes to Marine Hall In Fleetwood this Christmas. Book now

Look out for our biennial Life In Wyre resident survey next month, where you can tell us what you think about living in Wyre and comment on various aspects of council and health services. More info to follow in October's edition.

Visit wyre.gov.uk to read all the latest news from Wyre, report problems such as dog fouling or fly tipping, pay your council tax and much more.
We'd love to know what you think of this e-news - email communications@wyre.gov.uk

Civic Centre Breck Road Poulton le FYde Lancashire FY6 7PU
This message was sent to stephanie.collinson@wyre.gov.uk; We hope you found it relevant. However, if you'd rather not receive future e-mails from us, please visit the opt-out link by clicking here.
Appendix 13 – Bodies and Organisations Consulted at Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Stage, 2017

This appendix lists in alphabetical order those bodies and organisations listed in the Local Plan consultation database and consulted as part of the publication of the Publication Draft Local Plan September 2017. The listing reflects a comprehensive review of the database in 2016.

<p>| AM Seafoods | Cleveleys Community Centre |
| Arcus Consultancy Services | Cleveleys Library |
| Armistead Barnett | Coalfiregrates |
| Arthritis Care | Cockerham Parish Council |
| Associated British Ports | CPRE Lancashire |
| Baines Endowed VC School | CTIL |
| Barnacre with Bonds Parish Council | Cunningham Planning |
| Barratt Homes | DCL Transport |
| Barrow Borough Council | De Pol Associates Ltd |
| Barton Grange | Department for Education |
| Barton Parish Council | DPDS Consulting |
| Barton Willmore | DPP |
| Bell Ingram | Eddy Jackson Media |
| Bellway Homes Ltd | Edgeplan Ltd |
| Bilsborrow Post Office &amp; Village Store | EE |
| Blackpool Council | Electricity NW |
| Blackpool Transport Services Limited | Ellel Parish Council |
| Bleasdale Parish Council | Elswick Parish Council |
| Bowgreave Residents Association | Emery Planning |
| Bowland Forest higher division parish council | Environment Agency |
| BPMRT | Eric Astbury Ltd |
| BT | Ericsson |
| Burlington Park Ltd | Euan Kellie Property Solutions |
| Cabus Parish Council | F Parkinson Ltd |
| Cadent Gas Limited | Fairhurst |
| Campaign for Real Ale | Fleetwood Civic Society |
| Canal and River Trust | Fleetwood Post Office |
| Cardinal Allen Catholic High School | Fleetwood Town Council |
| Carleton St. Hilda's C.E. Primary School | Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty |
| Carr Head Primary School | Forton Parish Council |
| Cass Associates | Fox Planning Consultancy |
| Catterall Parish Council | Freeport Fleetwood |
| Cavitech Solutions | Frost Planning Ltd |
| CBRE Limited | Fylde Borough Council |
| Central Lancs Friends of the Earth | Fylde Coast Bridleways Association |
| Chipping Parish Council | Fylde Coast YMCA |
| Churchtown Flood Defence Group | Fylde Ramblers Association |
| CLA |  |
| Claughton on Brock Parish Council |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garner Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garstang Area Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garstang Chamber of Trade and Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garstang Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garstang Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL Hearn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goosnargh Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Anthony Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Eccleston &amp; District Agricultural Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Eccleston Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Eccleston Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Preston CCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hambleton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Pitt Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgson Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollins Strategic Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Builders Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes and Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Sharp &amp; Partners LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingle’s Dawndew Salad Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Waterways Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J &amp; M Parr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Lampert Associates Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rowe RIBA Chartered Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilkinson &amp; Son (Builders) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWPC Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone Design Associates Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland and Catterall St Helens CoE Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knott End Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LALC Wyre Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Archaeological Advisory Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Archaeological Advisory Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Constabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire County Council, School Planning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire County Council, Planning and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire County Council, Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire County Council, Flood Risk Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire County Council-Fleetwood Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Enterprise Partnership Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morecambe Bay CCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Canal Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Property Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes Vets Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Eccleston-with-Larbreck Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockwood Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lofthouse of Fleetwood Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M L Planning Consultancy Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Management Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Place News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAteer Associates Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Glow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN Associates (UK) Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Homes (North) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Town Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir Group Housing Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myerscough and Bilsborrow Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myerscough College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA Whittingham Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nateby Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nateby Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Lichfield &amp; Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Energy Wyre Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether Wyresdale Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neve Fleetwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Fylde and Wyre Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and Western Lancashire Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Lupus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPL Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Vision Blackpool, Fylde and Wyre Society for the Blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Holly Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Reach  
Out Rawcliffe / Upper Rawcliffe Parish Council  
Over Wyresdale Parish Council  
Overton Parish Council  
P & R Fenton Ltd  
P Wilson & Company  
Peacock & Smith  
Penspen Ltd  
Persimmon Homes Lancashire  
Peter Brett Associates LLP  
Pilling Parish Council  
Planning Inspectorate  
Planning Prospects Ltd  
Play Inclusion Project  
Poulton le Fylde the Breck Primary School  
Poulton St Chads C of E Primary School  
PRDS  
Presesall Town Council  
Preston City Council  
Property Capital PLC  
Ramblers Association (Garstang Group)  
Rapleys LLP  
RDJ Creative Ltd  
Regenda Ltd  
Residential Parks Ltd  
rg+p Ltd.  
Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Richard Turner and Sons  
RMP Architect Limited  
Rossall School  
RSPB  
Rural Solutions  
Rural Splash Garstang LTD  
Russell Armer Homes  
Saint Aidan's Church of England High School  
Save-our-Scorton residents' Association  
Savills  
Scorton Post Office  
Seasonal Landscapes  
Sedgwick Associates  
Seniors NW Ltd  
Shell UK  
Shepherd Planning  
Showmens Guild of Gt Britain  
Simmons Construction  
Singleton Parish Council  
Smith & Love Planning Consultants Ltd  
Sport England  
SSA Planning

St John’s Catholic Primary School  
St Mary's Catholic Primary School, Great Eccleston  
St William’s Catholic Primary School  
St Wulstan and St Edmund Catholic Church  
Stalmine with Staynall Parish Council  
Stalmine with Staynall Residents’ Association (SSRA)  
Steven Abbott Associates LLP  
Story Homes  
Strategic Land Group  
Stratus Environmental Limited  
St Mary & James RC Church  
Taylor Wimpey  
TC Whiteside & Sons  
Tenant Farmers Association  
The Churchtown Society  
The Coal Authority  
The Diocese of Lancaster  
The Gardens Trust (formerly the Garden History Society)  
The Mount View Practice  
The Squash Public House  
The Woodland Trust  
Theatres Trust  
Thornton Action Group  
Thornton Equestrian Centre  
Thornton Library  
Thornton Primary School  
Three (3)  
Thurnham Parish Council  
Total Finance & Amberlife  
Treasels, Roseacre and Wharles Parish Council  
TSJ Newsagents  
Turner Builders Ltd  
United Utilities  
Vernon & Co  
Verona Association  
Vinnolit Hillhouse Limited  
Wainhomes (North West) Limited  
Walton & Co (Planning Lawyers) Ltd  
West & Company  
Winmarleigh Parish Council  
Woodplumpton Parish Council  
Worthington Sharpe  
WYG  
Wyre Area Road Safety Committee  
Wyre Tidal Energy Ltd  
Wyresdale Park Estates
Appendix 19 - Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 – Representations by Part of Plan (Soundness and General Comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Part of Plan</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Not sound</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Portrait and Key Issues</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Objectives</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Strategy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Policies</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Development Management Policies</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMP1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Representations by Policy (Soundness and General Comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Part of Plan</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Not sound</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMP2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMP3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMP4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMP5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMP6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Representations by Policy (Soundness and General Comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Part of Plan</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Allocations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – SA1 (General)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – proposed new Allocations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1 - Residential – allocations SA1/1 to SA1/27</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA2 - Employment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA3 - Mixed Use</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA4 - Hillhouse Technology Enterprise Zone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA5 - Port of Fleetwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA6 - Travelling Showpeople Site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Part of Plan</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA7 - Development Opportunity – Brockholes Industrial Extension, Catterall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No policy/part of Plan identified</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices available as separate documents

The following appendices are available as separate documents (for the submission of the local plan some documents have been merged):

Appendix 3 – Call for Sites 2012 publicity and consultation material
Appendix 4 - Call for Sites 2014 publicity and consultation material
Appendix 5 - Call for Sites 2015 publicity and consultation material
Appendix 6 – Issues and Options 2015 publicity and consultation material
Appendix 7a – 7h – Issues and Options 2015 Main Matters Raised by Question
Appendix 9 – Issues and Options 2015 Main Matters – Local Plan/Further Response
Appendix 10 – Issues and Options 2015 – Specific Site Comments and Local Plan Response
Appendix 12 – Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 – Publicity and Consultation Material
Appendix 14 – Summary of Responses to the Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017
Appendix 15 - Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) and Housing Supply – Summary of Main Matters and Wyre Council Response
Appendix 17 - Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 – Highway Matters - Summary of Main Matters and Lancashire County Council Response
Appendix 18 - Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan 2017 – Viability Study – Summary of Main Matters and Keppie Massie Response