EiP Statement
Wyre Council Local Plan

Our ref 42026/02/MW/BOC
Date 25 April 2018

Subject Matter 8 – Allocations (Garstang, Bowgreave, Catterall and Barton)

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Lichfields is instructed by Taylor Wimpey UK Limited [TW] to make representations on its behalf to the Wyre Council Local Plan [WCLP].

1.2 This statement has been prepared in response to the Matters, Issues and Questions raised by the Inspector for the Matter 8 Examination in Public [EiP] hearing sessions.

1.3 Separate representations have been submitted in respect of the following Matters:

1 Matter 1 – Legal Compliance, Procedural Requirements and the Duty to Cooperate
2 Matter 2 – Strategy and Strategic Policies
3 Matter 3 – Housing and Employment Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) and Requirements
4 Matter 4 – Housing Land Supply
5 Matter 5 – Specific Housing Needs and Generic Housing Policies
6 Matter 9 – Infrastructure and Delivery

1.4 These Matter Paper representations should be read in conjunction with previous submissions on the WCLP [Representor ID 363] as well as those made on other Matters listed above.

1.5 TW is seeking to bring forward a high quality sustainable and comprehensively masterplanned residential extension on land West of Cockerham Road [Site ref. SA1/16] and land further to the north and west of the draft allocation. This would assist in the delivery of sustainable development within the borough by making a significant contribution towards meeting the identified needs for market and affordable housing.

1.6 This statement expands upon TW’s previous representations made throughout the Local Plan preparation process in light of the Inspector’s issues and questions. Where relevant, the comments made are assessed against the tests of soundness established by the National Planning Policy Framework [the Framework] and the National Planning Practice Guidance [Practice Guidance].
2.0 Planning Issues

Issue 1 – Identification of Sites

Is the approach within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to assessing the suitability and screening of sites in Garstang, Bowgreave, Catterall and Barton robust?

1.7 TW supports the approach taken in the SHLAA (July 2010) and the assessment of the draft allocation and land to the north and west in its entirety [Site ref. GST_25]. It was identified as having capacity to deliver a yield of approximately 235 dwellings on a net developable area covering 60% of the site, at a density of 28 dwellings per hectare. The SHLAA demonstrated that the land at Cockerham Road performed very strongly as a prospective housing land allocation and confirmed that it:

1. Occupies a suitable and sustainable location for residential development;
2. Is accessible to local facilities in Garstang;
3. Is accessible to public transport;
4. Is free from major environmental and technical constraints;
5. Is not affected by flooding;
6. Is not sensitive in landscape and visual terms;
7. Does not contain best and most versatile agricultural land;
8. Can be provided with necessary future infrastructure, and,
9. Can be viably developed in the medium to long term (circa post-2022)
However, this approach was not taken forwards in the 2017; Site ref. GST_25 was illogically subdivided into five separate parcels and, ‘sieved out’ land to the north [Site Ref. GST25_03] and west [Site Ref. GST_25] of the draft allocation as illustrated in Figure 2.

The SHLAA (2017) provides no reasoned justification or explanation as to why the site has been subdivided into the separate parcels. The methodology fails explain the approach used in the identification of parcel boundaries. The parcel boundaries are illogical as they do not follow landscaped or physical boundaries or consider current land use characteristics. Failure to adopt appropriate boundaries as part of the identification of sites will have impacted on the assessments carried out in the SHLAA. It is therefore considered that the SHLAA fails to robustly assess the suitability of sites for development in Garstang.
The parcel of land located to the west of the draft allocation was ‘sieved out’ of the 2017 SHLAA for reasons outlined below:

- Access onto narrow lanes;
- The existing on-site electricity infrastructure; and,
- The existing Public Right of Way [PROW] which crosses the site.

These issues are not relevant when considered in the context of the wider area of land which TW is promoting.

**Access onto a narrow lane**

In relation to the access onto narrow lanes, the Masterplan (Figure 3) for the draft allocation and wider area of land for which TW is promoting details the principal access points to be delivered off Croston Lane to the south and Cockerham Road to the east which would mitigate the need to provide a principal access on to the ‘narrow’ Nateby Crossing Lane. This constraint is therefore not relevant when considered in the context of this wider area land. The Masterplan demonstrates that the draft allocation and wider area of land can be suitably accessed off Croston Lane and Cockerham Road which mitigates the need for a principal access to be delivered on to Nateby Crossing Lane.
The existing on-site electricity infrastructure

1.13 The Masterplan has been informed by a constraints and opportunities plan which has ensured that all existing elements of the site are appropriately incorporated into the design and layout of the scheme. Regarding the existing electricity infrastructure, this has been incorporated into a central green link which covers the length of the site and connects to other central green spaces. It’s inclusion within this green link is purposeful to ensure that it does not impact on the proposed areas for residential development and that appropriate set back distances are maintained. It is considered that the existing electricity infrastructure is not a restrictive constraint that would prevent the delivery of development on this parcel of land. This is particularly pertinent when considered in the context of the draft allocation and wider area of land for which TW is promoting; the Masterplan demonstrating that this element of the site can be appropriately included into the design and layout of the scheme without impacting on the areas of proposed residential development.

Public Right of Way

1.14 The PROW has been retained and incorporated into the design and layout of the scheme. It is envisaged that this PROW will be enhanced where possible to improve pedestrian and cycle connectivity to Garstang, the surrounding countryside and wider local footpath network. Similar to the existing electricity infrastructure, the footpath has been incorporated as part of a green link which connects to other areas of green space and informal recreation. The proposed areas for development have been laid out to ensure that the access to the footpath and its trajectory are retained. The existing PROW is not considered to be a restrictive constraint that would prevent the delivery of development on this parcel of land. The Masterplan demonstrates that the PROW can be effectively retained and incorporated into the design and layout of the scheme without being impact by the areas for proposed residential development.

1.15 Regarding the parcel of land to the north of the draft allocation, this was ‘sieved out’ of the SHLAA based on its detached and isolated location. This constraint is not relevant when considered as part of the draft allocation and wider parcel of land. Indeed, the site abuts the urban area of Garstang, is well contained by the road network and is considered to form a well contained and logical residential extension. The Masterplan ensures that this parcel of land is well connected to the wider site by both footpath and cycle connections. This parcel of land also benefits from proximity to the retained PROW which connects to Garstang, the surrounding countryside and wider local footpath network. It is therefore considered that this constraint is not relevant when the parcel of land is included and assessed as part of the draft allocation and wider area of land.

Conclusion

1.16 Drawing these points together, it is considered that the approach taken within the 2017 SHLAA towards assessing the suitability of sites is inconsistent and illogical. It fails to provide a robust assessment of sites. This is particularly pertinent when considered in the context of the assessment carried out on the wider area of land TW is promoting; the reasons for sieving out land to the north and west of the draft allocation would not be considered relevant when assessed in its entirety.
Figure 3 Proposed indicative masterplan

Source: Taylor Wimpey
**Issue 5 – West of Cockerham Road (SA1/16)**

**Is the extent of the allocation and its capacity appropriate?**

1.17 As set out within the representations submitted to the consultation on the WCLP Publication Draft, whilst TW strongly supports the draft allocation for residential development, it objects to the limited extent of the allocation; namely the exclusion of land to the north and west and, considers that the wider area forms a more logical urban extension. The principal reasons for the objection are:

1. The WCLP has not ensured that sufficient deliverable land is allocated to meet the Borough’s OAHN in full;

2. The wider site is not constrained by any technical or environmental constraints; and,

3. The wider site is well contained and represents a logical and sustainable site for residential development.

**Objectively Assessed Housing Need**

1.18 As covered in greater detail in Matter 3, TW considers that the WCLP has failed to provide a positive approach to housing delivery. As currently drafted, it does not accord with the objectives of the Framework\(^1\) to boost significantly the supply of housing. It is recognised throughout the WCLP that there is sufficient deliverable land to meet only 86% of the Borough’s OAHN over the plan period which represents a shortfall of 1,356 dwellings.

2.1 It is clear that the other authorities in the HMA (Blackpool and Fylde) are unable / unwilling to assist Wyre in meeting its housing requirement. This was acknowledged in a letter from the Fylde Local Plan EiP Inspector, who conducted Stage 1 examination hearing sessions, which stated:

> "I acknowledge that there is a strong possibility that Wyre Council may not be able to meet all of its objectively assessed housing need within its own administrative area. However, I note that the emerging Local Plan for Wyre is at an early stage of production. I consider that there is insufficient evidence available at this time to ascertain with any degree of certainty the level of any unmet need and the proportion that may need to be accommodated in Fylde."\(^2\)

1.19 However, this does not sufficiently justify the failure to plan adequately for its identified need. There is significant demand for housing in Wyre and TW therefore wishes to reiterate that more needs to be done by the Council to ensure that it is able to meet its OAHN within its own administrative area including exploring every possible avenue to ensure appropriate highway infrastructure and mitigation can be put in place to deliver the Council’s full OAHN.

1.20 In this regard, TW requests that the boundaries of the draft allocation are extended to include the wider area of land to the north and west. When taken together, these two parcels of land form a logical extension to the settlement of Garstang and have the capacity to deliver c.150 extra units which equates to 11% of the 1,356 dwelling shortfall. This would make a significant contribution to the Borough’s housing land supply and assist in meeting the OAHN in full.

1.21 Taylor Wimpey’s highway consultants, Curtins, have considered the movements likely to be generated by an additional 150 dwellings on this site in the am and pm peak. Their analysis is

---

\(^1\) The Framework §47

\(^2\) Letter dated 11th April 2017 – §2
set out in Table 1 and indicates that there would be an additional 84 two-way movements in both the am and pm peak.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwellings</th>
<th>AM Peak (0800-0900)</th>
<th>PM Peak (1700-1800)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Curtins

1.22 Curtins has concluded that the additional movements at the am and pm peak generated by the 150 dwellings, in conjunction with the draft allocation (Ref SA1/16) can be accommodated without causing a severe impact on the surrounding highway network. Curtins also consider that the Council’s concerns in relation to highway capacity are overstated and more development could be accommodated in Wyre.

**Technical and Environmental Constraints**

1.23 Whilst TW, supports the Council’s acknowledgement that the draft allocation is suitable, achievable and deliverable, hence its allocation in the WCLP, it has failed to recognise that the wider area of land to the north and west is also suitable for development and has no overriding technical or environmental constraints that would impact on its delivery. This is confirmed in the Development Statement which accompanied the representation submitted to the consultation on the WCLP Publication Draft, the key points of which are summarised below:

1. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk of flooding;
2. None of the trees identified within the site are subject to Tree Preservation Orders;
3. The site is not constrained by any local, regional or international statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designations;
4. The masterplan for the site has been sensitively designed to ensure that key landscape characteristics are maintained, in particular the existing PROW;
5. The site is not included within a conservation area nor within the vicinity of any designated or undesignated heritage assets, listed buildings or scheduled ancient monuments;
6. The site benefits from its proximity to Garstang and associated utilities infrastructure;
7. There are no active or historic landfills located within the site; and,
8. The site is neither covered nor in the vicinity of an Air Quality Management Areas [AQMAs].

1.24 In relation to highways, a Traffic & Transport Note (Appendix 1) accompanied representations submitted to the consultation on the WCLP Publication Draft and considers whether the transport infrastructure in the area could accommodate additional development over and above the 100 units currently allocated (i.e. the wider site being promoted by TW). The Note demonstrates that Garstang is a sustainable location and, that there is capacity, or the opportunity to increase capacity, on the strategic road network and local highway network, and that the quantum of development currently allocated at land to the west of Cockerham Road could be increased.
1.25 In particular, it makes reference to the package of highways improvements which would provide additional capacity at Junction 1 of the M55, along with the benefits associated with the Preston Western Distributor Road and Broughton Bypass. It also notes that Lancashire County Council has developed a package of improvement measures that recently approved schemes will be required to contribute towards the mitigate traffic impact on the local highway network.

1.26 As a sustainable settlement, Garstang provides access to a number of bus services which deliver regular services to Lancaster, Preston, Blackpool and Morecambe together with other local centres.

**Deliverability**

1.27 As covered in detail in Matter 2, Garstang is identified in Policy SP1 (Development Strategy) as a Key Service Centre and is considered a sustainable location for new development providing access to local services and facilities together with education and employment opportunities.

1.28 The wider area of land is well contained by physical, durable boundaries which would prevent the unrestricted sprawl of the settlement. Indeed the development of this wider area of land would consolidate the town and form a logical, well contained, residential extension to Garstang. Furthermore, as outlined in the preceding paragraphs, there are no overriding technical or environmental constraints that would impact on the delivery of residential development.

**Conclusion**

1.29 Drawing these points together, whilst TW strongly supports the draft allocation, it objects to the extent of the boundary and the exclusion of the wider area of land to the north and west. In this regard, it is considered that the extent of the allocation is inappropriate because:

1. The WCLP has not ensured that sufficient deliverable land is allocated to meet the Borough’s OAHN in full;
2. The wider site is not constrained by any technical or environmental constraints; and,
3. The entire site is well contained and represents a sustainable site for residential development and a logical extension to Garstang.

**Is the Council satisfied that highway and transport impacts can be mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?**

1.30 As set out in the preceding section, a Highways and Transport Note prepared by Curtins accompanied the submission of representations to the consultation on the WCLP Publication Draft and considers whether the transport infrastructure in the area could accommodate additional development of the draft allocation and the wider land to the north and west. The Note demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity, or the opportunity to increase capacity, within the existing local and strategic network to accommodate a higher quantum of development in Garstang.

1.31 The draft allocation benefits from good access to public transport, specifically the bus services operating within Garstang which provide access to Lancaster, Preston, Blackpool and Morecambe together with other local centres. The closet bus stop to the draft allocation is located 280m to the south of the site on Croston Road. One of the Key Development Considerations of Policy SA1/16 states that:
“A financial contribution towards the Primary Sustainable Transport is made, which includes the improvements of specific junctions within the area.”

1.32 TW accepts that financial contributions will be required for Primary Sustainable Transport within Garstang. Improving the public transport offer in Garstang will invariably decrease the reliance on cars and will assist in mitigating the impact that new development may have on the local highway network.

**Are all the Key Development Considerations necessary and clear to the decision maker?**

1.33 As outlined in representations submitted to the consultation on the WCLP Publication Draft, TW objects to a number of the Key Development Considerations on the premise that they are unclear and neither justified nor necessary. These have been summarised below:

1. The site is brought forward in line with a Masterplan which will be agreed with the Council prior to the submission of an application.

   The agreement of a masterplan prior to the submission of an application is neither necessary nor justified. A masterplan can be agreed as part of the planning process; the submission and approval of a masterplan prior to the submission of an application will delay the delivery of development on the Site.

   Suggested rewording:

   “The site is brought forward in line with a Masterplan which will be agreed with the Council as part of an application submission.”

2. The development is supported by a landscape and green infrastructure framework.

   TW accepts that landscaping and green infrastructure may need to be provided as part of the development. However, as currently drafted, it is unclear how any such requirement would be applied to the site and what impact this would have on the developable area.

   Suggested rewording:

   “The development is supported by a landscape and green infrastructure framework which is based on an appropriate and up-to-date evidence base and a specific policy requirement.”

3. Land is made available for a new primary school which will form part of the financial contribution towards education.

   The requirement to make land available for a primary school is neither justified nor necessary. There is no evidence to justify why this draft allocation is identified as having to make land available for the provision of a primary school.

   An Education Report (Appendix 2) has been prepared to accompany this submission. In relation to Garstang Community Primary, the closest primary school to the draft allocation, the report sets out that this school is set on 2.5ha site which is considered large enough to accommodate a three-form entry school that has the capacity to accommodate up to 630 places.

   The report evidences that there is a combined surplus capacity of 73 primary school places within Garstang Community Primary School, Garstang St Thomas Primary School and, St
Mary’s and Michael’s Primary. When utilising LCC’s Child Yield multipliers this number of pupils is the equivalent of 192 new four-bedroom dwellings, or 456 new three-bedroom dwellings. Finally, Winmarleigh Primary, also in walking distance of the draft allocation, has a surplus capacity of 30 primary school places. Similarly, Nateby Primary has a surplus capacity of 18 primary school places.

Given the existing potential capacity within Garstang Community Primary would be prudent to extend this school, utilising the contributions made through S.106 Agreements from neighbouring developments, rather than making land available on draft allocation SA1/16. Extending Garstang Community Primary School would be more logical than delivering an entirely new and separate school, namely because; the principle of development has been established and, the necessary infrastructure is in place to facilitate its operation together with a management system. Furthermore, it would be difficult to establish a new school in such proximity to Garstang Community Primary School which in itself is well established.

This approach towards addressing primary school capacity is appropriate when considered in the context of the draft allocation where there has been no consideration as to how the provision of land for a primary school will impact on the net developable area of the site. This is particularly pertinent as the Council is only able to meet 86% of its objectively assessed housing need. In this regard, TW therefore requests that appropriate education contributions are sought for the expansion of the existing Garstang Community Primary School rather than land being made available within the draft allocation SA1/16.

This Key Development Consideration is therefore considered unnecessary because: a) there is no evidence to justify why land for a new primary school needs to be made available on this draft allocation; b) there is existing capacity within primary schools identified in the catchment area of the draft allocation; and, c) there is capacity to extend the Garstang Community Primary School through utilising contributions made from S.106 Agreements.

Suggested rewording:

“A financial contribution is made towards the expansion of Garstang Community Primary School”

A financial contribution towards the Primary Sustainable Transport is made, which includes the improvements of specific junctions within the area.

Whilst TW acknowledges that contributions will be required to Primary Sustainable Transport, these must be relevant, evidenced and justified.

Suggested rewording:

“A financial contribution towards Primary Sustainable Transport is sought, which includes improvements to the local highway network and specific junctions with Garstang where there is evidence of need for improvements”
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Curtins has been appointed on behalf of Taylor Wimpey to provide traffic and transportation advice to support representations to the Wyre Local Plan process.

1.2 Background

1.2.1 Future development within Wyre will be guided by the plans and policies within Wyre’s emerging new Local Plan. This will set out a vision for growth and development of the entire borough to 2031, including where new homes, employment and shops will be located, as well as which areas are to be protected.

1.2.2 The Draft of the Local Plan is currently being prepared for public examination which is due to commence in May 2018.

1.2.3 Taylor Wimpey is promoting Site SA1/16 – West of Cockerham Road, Garstang, which is included within the emerging Local Plan as a housing allocation (for up to 100 dwellings). Taylor Wimpey is also promoting land to the north and west of the allocation for a further circa 150 dwellings as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the site.

Figure 1 – Site SA1/16
Garstang remains ranked in the settlement hierarchy as a 2nd tier Key Service Centre, the only one in the Borough, with just 10% of the planned growth apportioned to it. This proposed scale of housing in Garstang has been largely influenced by highway capacity studies undertaken by Lancashire County Council [LCC]. LCC considered that Garstang would not be able to accommodate any further housing growth beyond what has currently been granted planning consent due to highway constraints along the A6 corridor and Junction of M55.

This view comes from a document LCC published in February 2017, titled “Implications for Housing Developments within the Proposed Wyre Local Plan”. This document was prepared in conjunction with Highways England and sought to provide an initial strategic view on the impact of the Local Plan housing projections on highway capacity.

Curtins has been instructed to consider whether the traffic and transport infrastructure in the area could accommodate the proposed additional land at Cockerham Road, Garstang for a further 150 dwellings.

**Purpose of this Report**

This note is intended to provide high level evidence which demonstrates that Garstang is a sustainable location and there is capacity, or the opportunity to increase capacity through committed infrastructure improvements, on the Strategic Road Network and Local Highway Network.
2.0 Planning History

2.1 Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/A/16/3142267

2.1.1 Following the decision by Wyre Borough Council to refuse the original planning application (App Ref: 14/00458/OULMAJ) in November 2015 in relation to an outline application for the erection of up to 270 dwellings, 4.68ha of land for employment (B1 and B8) uses, convenience store (up to 375sqm sales area) and coffee shop (up to 2356sqm sales area) the decision was successfully appealed by the applicant (J Chippendale Limited) following a Public Inquiry.

2.1.2 The application relates to 16.6ha of land that is located immediately to the south of Site SA1/16 which incorporates the A6 to the east and is bound by Croston Barn Lane to the north, the Lancaster Canal to the south and Nateby Crossing Lane to the west.

2.1.3 The approved mixed-use scheme will provide a number of residential dwellings as well employment and complementary retail services that would benefit the surrounding area.

2.1.4 The proximity of the approved site to Site SA1/16 is highlighted as a sustainability benefit within the Wyre Local Plan 2017 Site Allocations Background Paper which recognises that the proposals will deliver additional retail and employments opportunities directly opposite the site.

2.1.5 The application was considered acceptable by the Lancashire County Council Highways (LCC) subject to the delivery of a package of S278 highway works and S106 developer contributions towards wider infrastructure works. It is evident that the local highway network in the immediate vicinity of the site could accommodate, or can be improved, to develop a large-scale development opportunity within Garstang.

2.1.6 As an adjacent site, Site SA1/16 and surrounding land can benefit from the committed highway infrastructure works as well as the potential vehicle reductions that the proximity to new retail and employment opportunities provides.

2.1.7 The primary vehicular access to the site would be taken from the A6 via a new four arm roundabout which would be delivered as part of the realignment of the A6 carriageway.

2.1.8 Two further vehicular access points would be created on Nateby Crossing Lane serving residential accommodation. It is also proposed that a pedestrian/cycle link to Garstang town centre would be created along the existing, disused railway line under the A6.

2.1.9 There were a number of key statements made by the Planning Inspector that will have implications on any further planning applications submitted in the local area in the future.
2.1.10 The most pertinent of which is that it was agreed that the scheme should be considered in isolation citing that:

- Pending applications are neither committed or formally allocated; and
- Highways England and LCC have developed a series of highway improvements to address the anticipated shortfall in highway capacity.

2.1.11 A package of pedestrian/cycle improvements, speed limit reviews and capacity improvements along the A6 corridor has been developed by LCC and it was concluded that whilst local junctions would operate above capacity on occasions, the LCC proposals (to be delivered via s278) will assist matters in terms of both safety and operation.

2.1.12 On this basis, the Inspector concluded that there would be no severe residual cumulative impact.

2.1.13 Whilst highway safety and operation is a key consideration in the surrounding area, the Planning Inspector concluded that the site is situated in a sustainable location. It can therefore be considered that the Cockerham Road site, as an immediately adjacent site, is also in a sustainable location.
3.0 Highways England

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Highways England (HE) is responsible for the management and maintenance of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) across the UK. In the vicinity of the site, this includes the M55 motorway and more specifically, Junction 1 of the M55.

3.1.2 The LCC report includes an overview of the quantum of development that is considered deliverable across the borough. As part of this process the study refers to ‘congestion on known strategic pinch points’ and makes reference to the M55 Junction 1. The overarching factor restricting development along much of the A6 is capacity constraints at the M55 Junction 1.

3.1.3 To the east of the Borough, the A6 provides connectivity between Garstang and the rural areas and the M6 and Preston. From the A6 there is no direct access to the M6 south of Junction 33 and instead a key access point is via Junction 1 of the M55. This contributes to congestion which exists in the Broughton area and at Junction 1 which also has significant implications for travel into Preston.

3.1.4 The idea/suggestion of a new motorway junction between junctions 32 and 33 of the M6 has been the subject of successive approaches from Wyre Borough Council to Highways England. Highways England has consistently cited policy as a reason which would preclude a new motorway junction in this general location, on a principal section of the national motorway network, to serve primarily local journeys.

3.1.5 LCC separately has pointed to the considerable costs of introducing a new junction in this area, partly due to the close proximity of the West Coast Main Line and Lancaster Canal along large sections of the A6-M6 route. At present there are policy, engineering (local and strategic highway networks) and financial/delivery obstacles that result in a new junction being not considered viable. Therefore, the addition of a new junction within this plan period is unlikely and has not been considered as part of the strategic assessments.

3.1.6 On the above basis, this section of the report considers Junction 1 in more detail.

3.2 M55 Junction 1 Operation

3.2.1 LCC has carried out detailed operation and capacity review of the M55 Junction 1 with support from HE. The review included new traffic data and considered committed development and other influencing development/proposals, including that from Wyre, Ribble Valley, Preston, Preston City Councils Local Plan (supported by LCC), a new motorway junction on the M55 (J2), Preston Western Distributor (PWD) and other highway infrastructure/changes.
3.2.2 The review and modelling exercise demonstrated that there will be some limited capacity on the A6 at M55 Junction 1, subject to delivery of the following elements:

- Slip road improvements at Junction 1 on HE network. In isolation, this improvement can only support some limited development, previous statutory comments accepted the impacts of Nateby Crossing Lane application and its financial contribution.

- PWD, M55 Jct.2 (approved October 2017) and associated measures.

- Other highway linkages yet to be provided by development currently being built out i.e. land north of Eastway.

3.2.3 LCC acknowledge that the new Junction 2 will provide some relief to Junction 1 as northwest Preston traffic will utilise Junction 2. An internal road through the D’urton Lane/Eastway development north of Preston will provide a route linking D’urton Lane (near Broughton Bypass) to Eastway. This will deliver an alternative route bypassing Junction 1 of the M55 for light vehicles. The new Junction 2 will also provide some relief to Junction 3 of the M55 which will release capacity for further development opportunities elsewhere within the Borough.

3.2.4 Since the completion of LCC’s review, the Broughton Bypass is now operational (as of October 2017). Further discussions with LCC has confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined. The intention is to allow the traffic conditions to stabilise before any collecting further data and undertaking a more comprehensive review.

3.2.5 In summary, the junction does experience some queuing and congestion but this is not unusual for a motorway junction during traditional peak hours. LCC has confirmed that following identified improvements Junction 1 of the M55 can accommodate further development traffic.

3.2.6 LCC suggest that the assessments are purely desktop based and not supported by a detailed Transport Assessment that future applications will need to provide.

3.2.7 It is LCC’s position that “individual sites brought forward would be done so on their own merits and require a satisfactory detailed transport assessment/statement.”

3.3 Preston Western Distributor

3.3.1 In addition to the above improvements, the Preston Western Distributor (PWD) was approved on the 4th October 2017 (App Ref: LCC/2016/0046) under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 by Lancashire County Council. This is a major £109 million package of highway improvements which can broadly be described as a new 4.3km dual carriageway linking the A583 at Lea to the M55 at Bartle with a new motorway junction. The East West Link Road which forms part of the wider scheme would be a 3.4km long single carriageway road linking Lightfoot Lane to the...
PWD, with segregated foot and cycle ways along its full length. Curtins understand that funding has been secured for the delivery of the PWD and it is scheduled to be completed by 2021.

3.3.2 A plan of the highway improvements is included below:

**PRESTON WESTERN DISTRIBUTOR AND EAST WEST LINK ROAD**

![Figure 3 - PWD](image)

3.3.3 The Environmental Statement prepared by LCC to support the scheme has been obtained from the Planning Portal and a review of this reveals significant benefits are predicted on the LRN and SRN.
3.3.4 The scheme would alleviate traffic congestion at key points on the local and strategic highway network and provide direct access to existing housing in North West Preston and Cottam. Further benefits are stated as follows:

- Provide relief to peak hour congestion for east west journeys using Preston City Centre,
- Enable delivery of priority sustainable transport measures with improvements for walking, cycling and public transport.
- Improved access and journey times to the motorway network from the Enterprise Zone at Warton,
- Support delivery of a proposed Cottam Parkway railway station,

3.3.5 It is anticipated that Junction 1 of the M55 is expected to benefit from noticeable reductions in traffic as a result of the implementation of the PWD.

3.4 Summary

3.4.1 To summarise, the M55 Junction 1 is currently operating within theoretical capacity, albeit some arms operate over capacity during the traditional AM and PM peak periods.

3.4.2 To alleviate congestion at the junction, LCC and HE have identified a package of improvements which would provide additional capacity to deliver future development.

3.4.3 Furthermore, the junction is expected to benefit from the Preston Western Distributor road and Broughton Bypass.

3.4.4 It is therefore concluded that the existing allocation could be increased and the M55 Junction 1 is not the key constraint that the LCC reports suggests it is.

3.4.5 It is noted that any future planning application would be supported by a detailed Transport Assessment that will include baseline traffic data to support the traffic impact assessment and determine the overall impact that further residential development within Garstang will have on the local and strategic highway network.
4.0 Local Highway Network

4.1 Implications on the Local Highway Network

4.1.1 Lancashire County Council is responsible for the Local Road Network (LRN) in Garstang.

4.1.2 It is anticipated that any future development of the Garstang site would be accessed via Cockerham Road. The B5272 Cockerham Road extends on a north/south alignment and has a width of approximately 8.5m in the vicinity of the proposed site. The highway is subject to the National Speed Limit throughout.

4.1.3 The A6 Preston – Lancaster Road runs to the east of the site and is a single lane two-way carriageway with a width of approximately 9m in the vicinity of the site including cycle lane provision. The highway is subject to various speed limits in different locations along the length of the road. Through Garstang, the A6 is subject to a speed limit of 50mph.

4.1.4 Croston Barn Lane runs on a west-east alignment and has a width of approximately 5.5m in the vicinity of the site. The highway is subject to the National Speed Limit throughout, and there are no parking restrictions along the road in the vicinity of the proposed site. Nateby Crossing Lane runs to the west of the site and is a single carriageway two-way road. The highway is subject to the National Speed Limit throughout.

4.1.5 It is noted that the key issue that is affecting the decision making process is the cumulative traffic impact at Junction 1 of the M55 which is situated over 13.5km to the south of Garstang.

4.1.6 Any future planning applications would need to be supported by a Transport Assessment which will identify impact at local junctions. LCC has developed a package of improvement measures that recently approved schemes will be required to contribute towards in order to mitigate traffic impact on the local highway network. These schemes include;

4.1.7 Initiative 1 – A6 Barton to Garstang Sustainable Transport Strategy. This scheme will deliver improvement of Pedestrian and Cycle Provision in the A6 Corridor, in particular:

   i. Provide continuous cycle lanes along the full length, achieved through carriageway widening, central hatching narrowing and coloured surfacing as appropriate.

   ii. Provide traffic islands or refuge islands in central hatched area. This will help regulate speeds and provide improved crossing places.

   iii. Use of Gateway features to emphasise village entry points.

   iv. Use of red textureflex sparingly but also continuously where required.
v. A review to declutter and resign as appropriate.

vi. Speed limit review to lower to 40mph or 30 where appropriate.

vii. Review of Bus stops in the corridor and improvements (to QBS) as Appropriate

4.1.8 This strategy can be delivered in a number of phases/smaller packages of improvement works that can be delivered through contributions from all major developments with an impact in the corridor, in line with the CIL tests.

4.1.9 Initiative 2 – Wider Improvement of A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Croston Barn Road/Green Lane West/B5272 Cockerham Road/Croston Road Signalised Junction The scheme includes an upgrade to MOVA operation and the provision of pedestrian/cycle facilities throughout the junction.

4.1.10 Initiative 3 – Improvement of Moss Lane/Longmoor Lane Priority Junction. The scheme includes improvements for pedestrians and cyclists and other safety measures.

4.1.11 Initiative 4 – Improvement of A6/A586, ‘The Avenue’ priority junction. The scheme includes full signalisation, pedestrian and cycle, speed reduction and other safety measures.
5.0 Wyre Council – Site Allocations Background Paper-Sept 2017

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 It is acknowledged by Wyre Council that whilst the capacity along the A6 corridor, notably Junction 1 of the M55, restricts future development opportunities there is currently permitted capacity for up 858 dwellings. This is based on 10 recent planning decisions in 2017, 9 of which were granted planning consent and a single application for 183 dwellings is subject to a planning appeal.

5.1.2 Notwithstanding the outcome of the future planning appeal, Wyre Council have concluded that there is capacity to allocate land for 183 dwellings along the A6 corridor.

5.1.3 Annex A – A6 Review of the Site Allocations Background Paper sets out the Councils methodology for identifying the most sustainable site(s) capable of accommodating 183 dwellings and are currently available for allocation in the Wyre Local Plan. The masterplan area being promoted by Taylor Wimpey has been identified as a suitable location that could take up this capacity.

5.2 Identification of Site SA1/16

5.2.1 The A6 Review confirms that Garstang is the largest settlement in the rural part of the borough and is ranked highest of all the settlements that were considered.

5.2.2 It goes on to state that Garstang has a wide range of services and facilities, with relatively good health and social infrastructure including a medical centre, pharmacy, dentists, three primary schools, a library, recreation provision, numerous pubs, several village and community halls and five churches. The nearest secondary school is Garstang Community Academy 2km to the south on the A6 at Bowgreave and accessible by bus. There is therefore a high degree of choice within the service and facility offer.

5.2.3 Garstang is clearly considered to be a highly sustainable settlement which is capable of accommodating further residential development and is justifiably identified by Wyre Council as the main focus for future sites.

5.2.4 Site SA1/16 is a collection of three sites with a combined site area of 5.81ha that Wyre Council believe could accommodate 100 dwellings. It is defined as a sustainably located site which provides the opportunity to develop new educational infrastructure alongside new housing development in an area close to a proposed development of housing and employment uses.

5.2.5 As a preferred site option, Wyre Council accepts at Table AA/7 (Annex A) that the site “offers the potential for a comprehensive development with no significant constraints and reasonable accessibility to services and facilities.”
5.3 Conclusion

5.3.1 It can be concluded that Garstang is a sustainable location which is capable of accommodating future residential development.

5.3.2 Whilst Wyre Councils review looked to identify potential locations for 183 dwellings it is noted that this is based on recent planning decisions which may or may not be delivered within the plan period.

5.3.3 There could therefore be additional capacity to deliver further housing within the preferred sites.
6.0 Accessibility of Garstang

6.1 Introduction
6.1.1 One of the key elements of national and local planning policy is to ensure that new developments are located in areas which are sustainable and where alternative modes of travel are available. Developments should not be isolated but should instead be located close to complementary land uses. Encouraging the integration of planning and transport supports the aim of reducing overall travel and use of private car.

6.1.2 Whilst the Garstang settlement area has already been defined by Wyre Council as a sustainable location, this section of the report considers the accessibility of Garstang and demonstrates that it is a suitable and sustainable place to locate new development.

6.2 Pedestrian Accessibility
6.2.1 The site adjoins the existing settlement boundary and developed area of Garstang, and lies within direct and convenient access of a wide range of local community facilities and services including, but not limited to, the following:

- The Co-Operative Foodstore;
- Booths Foodstore;
- Sainsburys Foodstore;
- Garstang Community Primary School;
- Garstang St Thomas Church of England Primary School;
- St Thomas’ Church
- The Bellflower and Th’Owd Tithe Barn public houses;
- Post Office;
- Hair Salons;
- GP Surgeries; and
- Dental Practice.

6.2.2 The allocation site has access to existing pedestrian infrastructure with Cockerham Road offering footways on the eastern side of the highway.

6.2.3 There is existing pedestrian infrastructure along surrounding roads with the A6 Preston – Lancaster Road, Croston Road and Green Lane West including features such as sheltered bus stops, pedestrian crossings including dropped kerbs and tactile paving.

6.2.4 The accessibility of local services has been considered in terms of their accessibility within a 500m, 1,000m and 2,000m walk of the site centre, corresponding to the “desirable”, “acceptable” and
“preferred maximum” distances suggested by the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT).

6.2.5 Within 500m desirable walking distance there is employment opportunities at Garstang Fire Station and Burlington Park (Holiday Park), in addition to Green Lane Veterinary Centre and various services within the industrial facilities located along Green Lane West.

6.2.6 Within 1,000m acceptable walking distance there are a number of facilities including Garstang YMCA Swimming Pool, Garstang Community Primary School, numerous food outlets and various small independent stores all located south east of the site.

6.2.7 To the east of the site there is Wyre Vale Holiday Park and Acresfield Health Club and Spa.

6.2.8 Within 2,000m maximum walking distance there is Garstang Canoe and Kayak Club, Garstang Football Club, Hudson Park, Garstang Post Office, a food retail store located south east of the site.

6.2.9 South of the site is the town centre of Garstang which has facilities such as banks, estate agents, Garstang Library and Leisure Centre as well as hairdresser, garden centre and Garstang Free Methodist Church located within it for users of the site to access on foot. There are also other restaurant/bars/pubs located south of the site and Garstang Saint Thomas’ CE Primary School and St Thomas’s Church.

6.3 Cycle Accessibility

6.3.1 In order to assist in assessing the accessibility of the site by cycle, an 8km cycle catchment has been considered for the site. The 8km cycling distance refers to a recommendation by Cycling England in the document ‘Integrating Cycling into Development Proposals’ (2009).

6.3.2 The catchment extends as far as Cockerham in the north, Calder Vale to the east, Bilsborrow in the south and Stake Pool to the west.

6.3.3 There is a local route that runs along the Lancaster Canal south of the site and National Cycle Route 6 is located approximately 2,000m east of the site and runs close to the M6 motorway. It runs from Watford to Windermere passing through Manchester, Sheffield and Leicester.

6.3.4 It is noted that there are numerous employment opportunities within Garstang and some further afield that are within the noted 8km catchment.

6.4 Bus Accessibility

6.4.1 The nearest bus stop to the site is located approximately 400m south east of the site on Croston Road. Table 5.1 details the services that call at these stops, and their associated frequencies:
The services that run via Croston Road provide access to and from the site to a number of locations in and around the Central Lancashire area such as Morecambe, Lancaster and Preston, again which provide connections to various employment opportunities within Lancashire.

Further bus stops are located slightly further away from the site and offer more services to different destinations. **Table 5.2** details the services that call at the stop on the B6430 Lancaster Road, approximately 700m east of the proposed site access, and their associated frequencies. It is also noted that these buses serve educational institutions such as Lancaster University and University of Cumbria in Lancaster, as well as local schools such as Garstang Community Academy, Preston College Campus and Runshaw College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Service</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak Hourly Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Morecambe - Lancaster - Garstang - Preston</td>
<td>Hourly - Hourly - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.1– Bus services and frequencies from Croston Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Service</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak Hourly Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Morecambe - Lancaster - Garstang - Preston</td>
<td>2 per hour - 2 per hour - 1 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40A</td>
<td>Lancaster - Garstang – Preston College Campus</td>
<td>1 in AM - N/A - N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40B</td>
<td>Lancaster – Garstang High School</td>
<td>1 in AM - N/A - N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Blackpool – Poulton-le-Fylde — Catterall – Garstang – Lancaster - Morecambe</td>
<td>1 per hour - 1 per hour - 1 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Garstang High School – Scorton – Dolphinholme</td>
<td>1 in AM - 1 in PM - N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Preesall – Stake Pool – Garstang - Galgate</td>
<td>1 in AM - 1 in PM - N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Garstang – Bilsborrow – Broughton – Fulwood – Our Ladys High School</td>
<td>1 in AM - 2 in PM - N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>Garstang – Catterall – Broughton – Runshaw College</td>
<td>1 in AM - 1 in PM - N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>Preston – Garstang – Lancaster Boys Grammar School</td>
<td>1 in AM - 1 in PM - N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>Preston – Garstang – Lancaster Girls Grammar School</td>
<td>1 in AM - 1 in PM - N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942</td>
<td>Garstang – Galgate – Lancaster University - Lancaster</td>
<td>1 in AM - 1 in PM - N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.2– Bus services and frequencies from B6430 Lancaster Road**
6.5  Settlement Hierarchy

6.5.1 Garstang remains ranked in the settlement hierarchy as a 2nd tier Key Service Centre, the only one in the Borough, with just 10% of the planned growth apportioned to it.

6.5.2 Whilst highway safety and operation is a key consideration in the surrounding area, at a recent planning appeal the Planning Inspector concluded that the site is situated in a sustainable location. It can therefore be considered that the Cockerham Road site, as an immediately adjacent site, is also in a sustainable location.

6.6  Summary

6.6.1 It is clear from the Council’s own settlement hierarchy and the LCC report that Garstang is well located to benefit from sustainable modes of travel and existing local services. This differentiates the settlements from many other locations and on the basis that there is a genuine alternative to car travel, or facilities which reduce the need to travel, it is considered that the housing allocation could be increased.
7.0 **Highway Impact Assessment**

7.1 **Introduction**

7.1.1 This section of the report assesses the impact of the proposed development on the highway network. As previously stated, Taylor Wimpey is promoting Site SA1/16 which is allocated in the emerging plan for 100 dwellings and land to the north of the allocation for 150 dwellings.

7.2 **Wider Highway Network Impact**

7.2.1 The Wyre Local Plan sets out that the housing need for Wyre over the period 2011-2031 is 9,580 however the LPA on the advice of LCC as the Highway Authority considers that only 8,224 dwellings can be delivered due to highway capacity constraints, hence a shortfall of 1,356. It is Curtins understanding that 1,646 dwellings have already been delivered over the period 2011/12 - 2015/16.

7.2.2 As detailed in Section 3 of this note, LCC has prepared a comprehensive document to assess the capacity of the highway network to accommodate indicative developments within Wyre. The study identifies M55 Junction 1 as the overarching factor restricting development along the A6 corridor.

7.2.3 Since the completion of LCC’s review, the Broughton Bypass is now operational (as of October 2017). Further discussions with LCC has confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined, however onsite observations confirm noticeable improvements in previously identified issues.

7.2.4 LCC have also confirmed that there is scope for additional development due to current benefits from the Broughton Bypass, however the intention is to allow the traffic conditions to stabilise before collecting further data and undertaking a more comprehensive review to establish this.

7.2.5 In addition to the above, the PWD was also approved in October 2017. It is anticipated that Junction 1 of the M55 will benefit from noticeable reductions in traffic as a result of the implementation of the PWD.

7.2.6 It is important to note that the shortfall of 1356 dwellings between the OAHN and the Local Plan equates to AM and PM traffic flows of circa 800 two-way movements (based on industry standard calculations using the TRICS database). This is a relatively minor amount of traffic that would disperse across the wider network in multiple directions from a variety of sources, thus further minimising any impacts at any single junction or link.

7.2.7 It has been demonstrated in the previous section that that the LCC review did not fully take into account major highway improvements that were planned in the area when considering future capacities. LCC also acknowledge that there is scope for future development to utilise traffic capacity of potential developments that have been considered as part of their own analysis that may not be delivered or approved at planning for any reason.
7.2.8 It is also worth noting that any future planning application for all the developments assessed would be accompanied by a Travel Plan. This will include a package of measures to encourage travel by sustainable modes and reduce single occupancy car journeys, thereby benefiting the operation of the highway network.

7.2.9 On the above basis it is considered that LCC’s assessment of the highway capacity is overly cautious and that there is scope to deliver further development without having a severe impact on the highway network.

7.2.10 In addition to the above, capacity assessments of key junctions along the A6 corridor has been undertaken to demonstrate the impact of the delivery of the full housing need of 9,580 dwellings over the period to 2031 and is detailed below.

7.2.11 For the purpose of this assessment, the total dwellings being promoted by Taylor Wimpey are identified as the development scenario. Approved developments and developments going through planning as well those identified within the Local Plan are referred to as committed development.

7.3 Scope of Assessment

7.3.1 The following junctions has been considered as part of the study area;

- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Lancaster Road
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Cockerham Road/Green Lane West/Croston Road/Croston Barn Lane (To be upgraded to MOVA operation and improvements to pedestrian/cycle facilities);
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Longmoor Lane/Moss Lane;
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/A586 The Avenue (to be signalised);
- A6 Garstang Road/Woodplumpton Lane/Whittingham Lane (Broughton Crossroads); and
- Junction 1, M55

7.3.2 Traffic surveys for the above junctions were undertaken by the independent survey company MHC on 6th June 2017 for the AM (0700-100) and PM (1500-1800) peak periods.

7.3.3 Assessment of the above survey traffic confirmed that the AM peak is 0730-0830 and PM peak 1645-1745. The AM and PM peak hour survey traffic is presented in Traffic Figures 01 and 02.

7.3.4 It is important to note that no further assessments of the A6 Garstang Road/Woodplumpton Lane/Whittingham Lane (Broughton Crossroads); and Junction 1, M55 due to the implementation of the Broughton Bypass. Onsite observation indicate that all the initial issues identified at these junctions have been alleviated.
7.4 Committed Development

7.4.1 The committed developments considered in the assessments are detailed in Table 7.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committed Development</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Developments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00891 Garstang Golf Club</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>95 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00040 Bowgreave House Farm</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>30 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00053 Kepple Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>75 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00266 Kepple Lane (Utopia)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>130 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00248 Joe Lane</td>
<td>Residential +</td>
<td>200 units, 42 appts, village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>centre and family pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00681 Daniel Fold Farm</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>122 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00353 Stubbins Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>44 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00072 Garstang Road (Avonhurst)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>29 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/2015/0306 639 Garstang Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>49 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00928 Calder House Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>45 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00625 Garstang Road (south of Shepherds Farm)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>72 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00955 Collinson PLC</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>6,000sqm extension to existing estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>891 Units and 42 apartments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developments currently going through Planning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/00420 Garstang Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00928 Calder House Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00144 Daniel Fold Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00241 Nateby Crossing</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00090 867 Garstang Road (Rostock Dairy)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00807 Shepherds Farm</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00743 Westfield Farm Retirement Village, Garstang</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residential Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>686 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4.2 Table 7.1 confirms that there is a total of 891 houses and 42 apartments approved as committed development with 686 houses currently going through the planning system. Overall 1577 houses and 42 apartments have been considered as committed residential development.

7.4.3 The AM and PM committed development traffic is illustrated in Traffic Figures 3 and 4 for the AM and PM peak.
7.5 **Traffic Growth**

7.5.1 The TEMPro database has been used to derive local growth factors for the plan year 2031. TEMPro is a program developed by the Department for Transport (DfT) providing traffic growth projections used in transport models and intended to act as a nationwide standardised distribution of growth in trip ends.

7.5.2 The datasets used in TEMPRO are long-term forecasts and they represent the DfT’s best estimate of the long-term response to demographic and economic trends based on information from the Census data and UK Commission for Skills and Employment etc.

7.5.3 Information about planned dwellings is derived from LPA plans and monitoring reports and based on targets/plans for the whole control area (Local Authority).

7.5.4 The growth factors are detailed as follows:

- AM Peak- 1.0873; and
- PM Peak – 1.0808.

7.5.5 The above growth factors have been applied to the survey traffic to obtain the 2031 background traffic flows and is presented in Traffic Figures 5 and 6 for the AM and PM peaks respectively.

7.5.6 The committed development traffic has been added to the 2031 background traffic to obtain the 2031 base with development traffic and is illustrated in Traffic Figures 7 and 8 for the AM and PM peak.

7.6 **Trip Generation**

7.6.1 In order to generate trip rates for the Taylor Wimpey residential development, the TRICS database has been interrogated. TRICS is the industry recognised tool for calculating the anticipated future trip demand of a proposed development. The database contains multi-modal surveys of varying land uses in multiple destinations across the UK including residential uses.

7.6.2 To derive the potential trip rates associated with the Taylor Wimpey development, the ‘Residential’ category of the TRICS database has been interrogated using the following criteria;

- Houses Privately Owned excluding sites in Greater London and Ireland; and
- Sites located in ‘Edge of Town’ or ‘Suburban Areas’.

7.6.3 Section 6 of this report demonstrates that the site is highly accessible by sustainable modes of travel and therefore it is considered that average trip rates would be representative when deriving the potential vehicle trips associated with the proposed development.

7.6.4 Table 7.2 below summarises the trip rates and subsequent vehicle trips associated with each phase of the proposed development.
### Trip Generation Based on TRICS

Table 7.2 confirms that the allocated 100 units will generate 56 two-way movements in both the AM and PM peak periods with the additional 150 units generating 84 two-way movements. It also shows that the 250 units would generate a total 140 two-way movements during both the AM and PM peak periods.

### Trip Distribution

#### Distribution of the above traffic onto the surrounding highway network has been calculated using journey to work information. This involves the use of 2011 Census ‘Journey to Work’ Data and is broadly summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage of Traffic (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 1</td>
<td>A586</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2</td>
<td>Longmoor Lane</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 3</td>
<td>Croston Road</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4</td>
<td>Moss Lane</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 5</td>
<td>A6 south</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 6</td>
<td>M55 east</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 8</td>
<td>A6 north</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 9</td>
<td>B5269</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3 – Trip Distribution Based on 2011 Census Data

The traffic distribution for the development traffic is illustrated in Traffic Figure 9. The development traffic shown in Table 7.2 has been assigned to the highway network using the above distribution. The
proposed development traffic for the 250 units is presented in Traffic Figures 10 and 11 for the AM and PM peak. The 2031 base with committed development has been added to the proposed development traffic to obtain the 2031 base with committed plus development traffic. This is presented in Traffic Figure 12 and 13.

7.7.3 All traffic figures are provided in Appendix A.

7.8 Junction Capacity Assessments

7.8.1 The following junctions been assessed using junction modelling packages as indicated below:

- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Lancaster Road - PICADY
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Cockerham Road/Green Lane West/Croston Road/Croston Barn Lane - LinSig;
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Longmoor Lane/Moss Lane - PICADY;
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/A586 The Avenue - LinSig;

7.8.2 The above junctions have been assessed for both the base and base with development scenarios to determine the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding highway network. The assessments have been undertaken using Junctions 8 (ARCADY and PICADY) and LINSIG. The modelling output can be provided if required.

Interpretation of Model Outputs

LINSIG

7.8.3 The signal controlled junctions under consideration have been assessed using LinSig. LinSig results refer to the Degree of Saturation (DoS) and Mean Maximum Queue (MMQ) predicted in each lane of the junction. A DoS of 100% indicates that the lane in question is operating at its theoretical capacity (point of saturation), whilst a DoS of 90% or less indicates that the lane is operating within its Practical Reserve Capacity.

ARCADY and PICADY

7.8.4 All ARCADY’s and PICADY’s have been undertaken using Junctions 8 modelling package. Results refer to the Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) and queue length predicted on each arm of the junction. An RFC of 1.00 indicates that the arm in question is operating at its theoretical capacity, whilst an RFC of 0.85 or less indicates that the arm is operating within its practical capacity.

Junction 1 – A6 Preston Lancaster Road/B6340

7.8.5 Analysis of the junction has been undertaken using PICADY, and the results are summarised in Table 6.1:
7.8.6 The results demonstrate that the junction operates within capacity for the AM peak in the base with committed development scenario for both the AM and PM peak. The results also confirm that the junction will continue to operate within capacity during both the AM and PM peak when the development traffic is added.

7.8.7 A comparison of the base with committed and the development scenario shows no material increase in capacity or queuing. On the above basis it is considered that the impact of the proposed development and the residual impact of all the developments identified in the local plan on the local highway network is not severe.

**Longmoor Lane/Moss Lane/A6**

7.8.8 Analysis of the junction has been undertaken using PICADY, and the results are summarised in Table 7.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arm</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DoS</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base with Committed Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6430 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base with Committed Development + Dev</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6430 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.5 – Longmoor Lane/A6/Moss Lane Capacity Assessment Results
7.8.9 Table 7.5 shows that the junction operates within capacity in both the AM and PM base for the committed/plan development scenario. The results also demonstrate that with the addition of the proposed development traffic the junction will continue to operate with spare capacity.

7.8.10 It is clear from the results that there is no material change in capacity and queues when the plan scenario is compared with the development scenario. It is therefore considered that the impact of the development is not severe at this junction.

*A6/A586 The Avenue*

7.8.11 This junction has been used assessed using LinSig and the results are summarised in Table 7.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arm</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DoS</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base with Committed Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 North Ahead</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 North Right</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 South Ahead Left</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A586 The Avenue Left Right</td>
<td>70.1 : 70.1%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base with Committed +Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 North Ahead</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 North Right</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 South Ahead Left</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A586 The Avenue Left Right</td>
<td>73.9 : 73.9%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6 – A6/A586 The Avenue Capacity Results

7.8.12 The results demonstrate that this junction operates with spare capacity during both the AM and PM peak base with committed/plan development scenario for the future year 2031. Also with the addition of the proposed development traffic the junction will continue to operate within spare capacity.

7.8.13 A comparison of the base with committed/plan scenario with the development scenario results confirms slight increase in queuing on all arms of the junction. This is likely to be imperceptible to existing road users and therefore not considered to be severe.

*A6 Preston New Road/Cockerham Lane/Croston Barn Lane/Green Lane West*

7.8.14 Table 7.7 summarises the LinSig results for this junction.
Table 7.7 confirms that the junction operates within capacity in the AM peak for both the base with committed development scenario and the base with development scenario.

For the PM peak the results demonstrate that the A6 south arm operates at practical capacity but well within its theoretical capacity in the base with committed/plan development scenario. When the development traffic is added the results confirm that the junction will operate above its practical capacity but within theoretical capacity.

As previously stated, LCC has identified this junction as requiring improvement as part of the wider improvements along the A6 corridor. The scheme includes upgrading the junction to MOVA operation and the provision of pedestrian/cycle facilities throughout the junction.

It is Curtins view that the implementation of the proposed improvements will improve the current operation of the junction and minimise any potential impact of the committed/plan development as well as the proposed development.

On the above basis it is considered that the impact of the proposals on this junction is not severe.
7.9 Summary

7.9.1 The assessments demonstrate that there would be additional 84 two-way movements in both the AM and PM peak as a result of the additional 150 dwellings. The capacity assessments confirm that the additional 150 dwellings can be accommodated without causing a severe impact on the surrounding highway network.

7.9.2 The shortfall of 1356 dwellings equate to AM and PM traffic flows of circa 800 two-way movements (based on industry standard calculations using the TRICS database). This is a relatively minor amount of traffic that would disperse across the wider network in multiple directions from a variety of sources, thus further minimising any impacts.

7.9.3 LCC did not fully take into account major highway improvements that were planned in the area when considering future capacities. The opening of the Broughton Bypass has been operational since October 2017. Further discussions with LCC have confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined but it is clear from on site observations that some of the earlier issues have been alleviated.

7.9.4 It is considered that major highway improvements should be fully considered.

7.9.5 The above assessments demonstrate that LCC’s position on the highway constraints is overstated. LCC also acknowledge that there is scope for future development to utilise traffic capacity of potential developments that have been considered as part of their own analysis that may not be delivered or approved at planning for any reason and therefore would need to be considered on first come first served basis.

7.9.6 Any future planning application for the site will also include a travel plan to encourage travel by sustainable modes and reduce the reliance on private car journeys providing opportunity for further development.
8.0 Conclusions

8.1.1 Curtins has been appointed on behalf of Taylor Wimpey to provide traffic and transportation advice to support representations to the Wyre Local Plan process.

8.1.2 Taylor Wimpey is promoting Site SA1/16 – West of Cockerham Road, Garstang, which is included within the emerging Local Plan as a housing allocation (for up to 100 dwellings). Taylor Wimpey is also promoting land to the north and west of the allocation for a further circa 150 dwellings.

8.1.3 The Council's own settlement hierarchy and the LCC report that Garstang is well located to benefit from sustainable modes of travel and existing local services. This differentiates the settlements from many other locations and on the basis that there is a genuine alternative to car travel, or facilities which reduce the need to travel, it is considered that the housing allocation could be increased.

8.1.4 It is noted that the key issue that is affecting the decision-making process is the cumulative traffic impact at Junction 1 of the M55 which is situated over 13.5km to the south of Garstang. In addition to a package of measures identified by the HE and the LCC to improve traffic flow at this junction, it is expected to benefit from the Preston Western Distributor road and Broughton Bypass.

8.1.5 The Broughton Bypass has been operational since October 2017. Further discussions with LCC have confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined but it is clear from onsite observations that some of the earlier issues have been alleviated.

8.1.6 With regards to the wider highway network, the shortfall of 1356 dwellings between the OAHN and the Local Plan equates to AM and PM traffic flows of circa 800 two-way movements (based on industry standard calculations using the TRICS database). This is a relatively minor amount of traffic that would disperse across the wider network in multiple directions from a variety of sources, thus further minimising any impacts.

8.1.7 The impacts of the committed/plan developments and the proposed development has also been assessed on the local highway network. This confirms that there is sufficient capacity on the local highway network and that the residual cumulative impact on the highway network will not be severe, subject to LCC's identified mitigation at the junction of A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Cockerham Road/Green Lane West/Croston Road/Croston Barn Lane being delivered.
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Briefing Note

Land at Cockerham Road, Garstang, Wyre, Lancashire

Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

BEN HUNTER
BA DipMS
1.0 Introduction

1.1 This proposed development is for between 100 and 270 new homes at Cockerham Road, Garstang (“the development”). Garstang is an old market town within the Wyre borough of Lancashire. It is 10 miles north of the city of Preston, and the same distance south of Lancaster. The approximate development outline can be seen below in Map 1:

![Map 1: Development Site Outline]

1.2 The proposed development is located in the centre of the Garstang District Ward (“the Ward”) within the Wyre Borough Council (“WBC”) planning area. The Education Authority for the area is Lancashire County Council (“LCC”). Map 2 demonstrates the Ward boundaries and the development’s location within the Ward:
1.3 This note looks in detail at the trends in dwelling delivery, of births and the age of the population over the last decade to create a context for this proposed development. The history of dwelling delivery identifies the likely proportion of new households, which are characterised by a younger population. The trend in birth numbers, too, is often linked to dwelling delivery and if rising, to younger populations. Births also indicate the future demand for school places. Finally, the trend in the median age of the population is an indicator of the nature of the area and how sustainable it is. The assumption is that the population should reflect national norms, which includes its ageing. When the balance of dwelling delivery does not maintain the median age of the population at around the national norm, there are implications for social infrastructure.

1.4 Existing local schools are identified and mapped, with Google Earth providing the approximate walking distances from the proposed development. The relevant schools, having been sorted by distance are then described for capacity, numbers of pupils by age and occupancy levels.
1.5 WBC do not have an adopted Community Infrastructure Levy ("CIL") charging regime. Accordingly, it is assumed that planning obligations will be sought via Section 106 agreements. The report continues on that basis.

2.0 Dwellings

2.1 WBC, at the end of 2016, comprised of 51,180 occupied dwellings. There has been an increase of 4,360 (9.3%) occupied dwellings in the area over the 16-year period shown in Table 1. This is an average increase of 291 dwellings per annum across the Wyre Council administrative area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occupied Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>46,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>47,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>47,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>48,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>48,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>48,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>48,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>49,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>49,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>49,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>49,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>50,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>50,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>50,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>51,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Occupied dwelling numbers WBC (Council Tax Returns published by ONS from VOA data)*

2.2 The increase in the number of dwellings across the WBC area over the 16-year period is shown in Graph 1. It can be seen that housing delivery has been relatively consistent between 2004 and 2016. Housing delivery peaked in 2003 (540 dwellings) and reached its lowest point in 2011 (130 dwellings). 2016, the most recent year for which data is available, was the fifth most productive year for housing occupations in the review period:

*Graph 1: Occupied Dwellings WBC*
2.3 Comparing housing deliver in the Wyre Council area with the Ward (Table 2), delivery is proportionately lower in the Ward. In 2004, a reduction in the number of occupied dwellings was witnessed. The annual average increase in new homes in the Ward was 26.

Table 2: Occupied dwelling numbers the Ward (Council Tax Returns published by ONS from VOA data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>2,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 Births

3.1 There has been an average of 965 births per year in the WBC area during the period between 2001 and 2016. Births peaked in 2006 – one of only two years where births exceeded 1,000 in a year. The overall trend is one of very little variation.

Table 3: Birth Numbers in WBC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>918</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Graph 3 charts the births in the WBC area over the 16-year period:

![WBC Births Graph](image)

3.3 Births in the Ward have averaged 31 per year. Births peaked in 2004 at 42 and reached the lowest levels in the review period in 2008 at 15. The general trend is one of slightly falling births, although throughout the review period the numbers and very low:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Birth Numbers in Garstang*

3.4 Graph 4 charts the births within the Ward:
3.5 The number of births relative to the number of dwellings within the Wyre Council area is shown in Graph 5. This shows a slightly falling trend. The peak was 2004 and 2006, which reflects the birth peaks in the WBC area in the same period:
4.0 Age

4.1 From the Census in 2001, the median age of the population was 4.7 years older than the national median age (42.6 years vs 37.9 years). Since then, WBC’s median age has increased at a slightly higher rate than the Nation as a whole. By 2016, WBC’s population was 7.4 years older than the national average (47.6 years vs 40.2 years). In essence, WBC has a population significantly older than the national picture and aging faster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Median Age WBC

4.2 Graph 6 demonstrates the change over the review period:
5.0 Migration

5.1 ONS estimate that between 2004 and 2016 the WBC area was a net importer of people, with every year seeing an increase in people coming in to the administrative area. The average across the years is a net additional 867 entering the WBC area per year, as demonstrated in Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBC</th>
<th>Mid Year Population Estimate</th>
<th>Long-Term International Migration</th>
<th>Internal Migration (within UK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Inflow</td>
<td>Outflow</td>
<td>Inflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>108,188</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>108,435</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>108,475</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>108,245</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>108,057</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>107,912</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>107,692</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>107,889</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>108,236</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>108,742</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>109,745</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>110,261</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Migration Flows WBC (ONS)*

5.2 When looking at the population change between 2015 and 2016, Wyre recorded negative yearly natural change estimates (more deaths than births). This statistic reflects the older age group of the population, who as a whole will be less fertile than the National picture.

5.3 Only Fylde and Chorley saw larger net internal migration into the county of Lancashire than Wyre. The increase in population to Wyre is due to the movements into the area rather than net addition of people through births, as demonstrated in Table 7:
Table 7: Change in Mid-Year Population Estimates (ONS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Components of change, 2015 to 2016</th>
<th>Change in estimated population, 2015 to 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylde</td>
<td>-383</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyndburn</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribble Valley</td>
<td>-114</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossendale</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ribble</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>-231</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre</td>
<td>-508</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire-12</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>7,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn with Darwen</td>
<td>-1,036</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>-383</td>
<td>-383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire-14</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>6,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>16,763</td>
<td>45,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>192,840</td>
<td>538,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.0 Child Yield

6.1 In 2012 LCC undertook an analysis to determine the number of pupils who attend mainstream schools who live in recently built houses. Based on this analysis LCC uses a method of assessing the impact of a development based on the mix of the size of the development, based on the number of bedrooms in each property to be built.

6.2 LCC’s pupil yield for each size of house can be seen in the table below. This is taken from LCC’s education contribution methodology in the document “Infrastructure and Planning Annex 2” adopted in November 2017:
6.3 LCC state in their Policy document:

*If the bedroom information is not available at the time of assessment, an assumption will be made that all dwellings will be eligible 4 bedroom housing and the development will be assessed on this basis. The application will then be reassessed once accurate bedroom information becomes available - this could be at the Reserved Matters stage of the application.*

6.4 Working on the basis above LCC forecast the following for this development:

- 100 dwellings x 0.38 = 38 Primary School pupils
- 100 dwellings x 0.15 = 15 Secondary School pupils
- 270 dwellings x 0.38 = 103 Primary School pupils
- 270 x dwellings x 0.15 = 41 Secondary School pupils

6.5 Our own forecast trajectory for this development, is based on a different methodology and measures the likely number of children resident whereas the WBC multiplier indicates an area-wide average for new enrolment in local schools. Of course, a proportion of households moving to new developments do not move very far and their children do not change school. In addition, the EFM demographic model identifies the 1-year peak, which persists over the WBC formula result by a varying amount over around a decade. The EFM model serves merely to substantiate that a request from an education authority is reasonable.

6.6 Based on a 100-dwelling development with a 3-year build-out at an average rate of 35 dwellings per annum, this development would be expected to generate, at its peak, 40 Primary School age children resident in 2029 (based on a start date of 2020) and 30 Secondary School age children resident in 2034. The number of 4-year-
olds expected to be generated by a development of this size is 6 at its peak, before settling down to 2 per year once the development reaches maturity:

Table 9: Forecast Trajectory for 100 dwellings in Garstang

6.7 Based on a 270-dwelling development with an 8-year build-out at an average of 35 dwellings per annum, this development would be expected to generate, at its peak, 100 Primary School aged children resident in 2031 (based on a start date of 2020) and 73 Secondary School aged children resident in 2037. The number of 4-year-olds expected to be generated at a development of this size is 15 at its peak, before settling down to 5 per year once the development reaches maturity:
6.8 When comparing the LCC approach to the EFM model, our assessment suggests that their figures are reasonable. They are also comparable to most Education Authorities across the country. It’s also clear that should this development deliver a proportion of 1-3-bedroom dwellings that the number of pupils generated will be lower than forecast.

7.0 Schools

7.1 In our assessment, we take into account all Primary schools within a 2-mile walking distance\(^1\), and all Secondary schools that lie within a 3-mile walking distance of the development. The 2 and 3-mile criteria are the distances prescribed beyond which local authorities are required to fund transport where the nearest available school is further away. It is the intention of both the planning system and the provision of state-funded schools that the ideal mode of travel to and from school is

---

\(^1\) Distances have been calculated based upon a postcode to the south of the development. Once the development is built, some parts of the site may be further/closer than shown.
walking or cycling. The NPPF makes this plain at paragraph 38 and the Education Act 1996 (as amended).

7.2 The authority is required to make pupil forecasts to the Department for Education on a year of age basis by ‘school planning area’ and identify each school in the cluster and its capacity. The forecasts cover the period for which birth data is available. Forecasts covered by Section 106 agreements are omitted. For primary school age pupils, the current published data runs to 2020/21 and for secondary 2022/23. These are known as the School Capacity ("SCAP") returns. This is how Government allocates its funding for additional school places that are its responsibility to provide.
7.3 Schools should be operationally full to meet the financial audit requirement for best value from public assets. This is demonstrative of a properly functioning school system. School funding is predicated on the number of pupils that are on a school’s roll, so is in the best interest of schools to maximise intake within their capacity. Accordingly, many schools take from a wide catchment area and some enrol over capacity.

7.4 The statutory rules on enrolment are that whilst schools may have a catchment area and ordered criteria for admissions, the rules only apply if the school is oversubscribed. Otherwise, whoever applies is admitted irrespective of where they live. This is known as ‘More Open Enrolment’. It fosters parental choice of school.

8.0 Primary Schools

8.1 There are five Primary schools within a 2-mile walking distance of the proposed development. Map 4 demonstrates the location of the schools in relation to the development:

Map 4: Primary Schools within the vicinity of the development
8.2 Table 11 details the current roll at the schools, which are all within the Lancashire administrative area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary School Name</th>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>LA Name</th>
<th>Distance (miles)</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>PAN</th>
<th>Yr R</th>
<th>Yr 1</th>
<th>Yr 2</th>
<th>Yr 3</th>
<th>Yr 4</th>
<th>Yr 5</th>
<th>Yr 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garstang Community Primary</td>
<td>PR3 1HP</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garstang St Thomas</td>
<td>PR3 1DR</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary and St Michael Primary</td>
<td>PR3 1JR</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulverston High Primary</td>
<td>PR3 1LA</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nateby Primary</td>
<td>PR3 1GP</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Surplus %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.39%</td>
<td>29.93%</td>
<td>16.09%</td>
<td>13.38%</td>
<td>29.63%</td>
<td>22.32%</td>
<td>24.69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Primary School Numbers on Roll January 2017
(NoR = Number on Roll; PAN = Planned Admission Number)

8.3 The closest school to the development is Garstang Community Primary School. This school has minor capacity in three of its seven year groups. It is over capacity in three year groups where it took small bulge classes.

8.4 When looking at the current catchment area of Garstang Community Primary, this development is ideally placed in very close proximity to the school. The catchment area of the school is quite large, as the school draws from Catterall in the south, Nateby in the west, and Scorton in the north. In order for the school to maintain their numbers, they have to draw from a wide catchment area, which in turn means that there is likely a large cohort of pupils coming in every day by car, past schools closer to their settlements that have capacity.

8.5 Should pupils from this development wish to attend Garstang Community Primary School, they would be very well placed within the selection criteria of the admissions arrangements to be able to gain a place. This would displace future pupils that wish to attend the school but live further afield and make the school more focused on children living in the immediate vicinity.

8.6 Map 5 demonstrates the current catchment area of Garstang Community Primary School:
8.7 Garstang Community Primary School is on a site of approximately 2.5ha (see Map 6). The school, at one form of entry, is on a site large enough, according to Building Bulletin 103, to accommodate a three form entry school (630 places). It would therefore make sense, from a planning perspective, to expand this school on its existing site utilising Section 106 contributions from neighbouring developments, should additional places be required.
8.8 The second closest school to the development is Garstang St Thomas. This school has minor capacity in six out of its seven year groups. The school is currently operating at 90% capacity with 22 surplus places.

8.9 When looking at the current catchment area of the school, the school takes pupils as far south as Catterall. This development is within the current catchment, and closer to the school than the current extremities of the catchment. As with Garstang Community Primary, should pupils from this development select this school as their first choice, they would be favourably viewed within the selection criteria to gain a place, compared to pupils living further afield:

8.10 With regards to the third of the Garstang Primary Schools, St Mary’s and St Michael’s Primary, this school has the most capacity of the three, with 47 surplus places across the year groups. The school has capacity in every year group. In order to maintain the current roll, it is necessary for the school to take from quite a large catchment area. Pupils are coming as far north as Forton, east of the M6 towards Calder Vale, and south to the south of Catterall. As with the first two schools reviewed,
this development is ideally placed within the catchment to gain a place over pupils coming from further afield:

Map 8: St Mary’s and St Michael’s Primary Catchment Area Heat Map (via schoolguide.co.uk)

8.11 Collectively, the three schools in Garstang have a capacity of 630 places, and are currently operating with 557 pupils, leaving a capacity of 73 pupils. When utilising LCC’s Child Yield multipliers (Section 6) this number of pupils is the equivalent of 192 new four-bedroom dwellings, or 456 new three-bedroom dwellings.

8.12 With regards to the two additional schools within walking distance of the site, these schools are very small, having space for only 8 and 13 pupils per year group respectively. Winmarleigh School has a capacity of 56 and a surplus of 30 places. The school does not currently have any pupils from Garstang in attendance; the school
takes pupils from Winmarleigh Village (which had a population in 2011 of 272) and
neighbouring Scorton. Nateby Primary has a capacity of 91 and 18 surplus places. The
school serves a much wider capacity than solely Nateby; they draw pupils from the
west in Out Rawcliffe and Eagland Hill, Winmarleigh in the north, and Catterall in the
south.

8.13 From a projections perspective, the five schools reviewed for capacity sit in a
planning area with six additional schools to form the ’Wyre/Garstang and Surrounding
Primary’ planning area. The eleven schools have a combined capacity of 1,283.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Sum 1617</th>
<th>1159</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual 1617</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Sum 1617</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast 1716</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Sum 1716</td>
<td>1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast 1819</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Sum 1819</td>
<td>1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast 1920</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Sum 1920</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast 2021</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Sum 2021</td>
<td>1368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast 2122</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Sum 2122</td>
<td>1397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Wyre/Garstang Primary SCAP Projections (LCC)

8.14 The projections show that in 2016/17 the schools had a combined roll of
1,159 against an available capacity of 1,283, which equated to a surplus capacity of
124 places. The forecast for 2017/18 suggests that the roll will have risen by 45
places, reducing the available places to 79 across all schools. According to LCC, they
are forecasting that the schools will be over capacity in 2019/20. By 2021/22, the
schools will be over capacity by 114 places. This means that the area will, ideally,
have an additional 1fe’s worth of expansion in order to provide sufficient places for
the forecast need, and build in some minor capacity to allow for an element of
parental preference for when it comes to selecting which school to send their children.

8.15 Section 10 of this report discusses the neighbouring developments to the
proposed Cockerham Road development that already have planning permission. When
reviewing the capacity in the local schools in Garstang, the projections for the area as
a whole, and the additional impact of new development, it is not unreasonable for
WBC to request Primary School contributions via Section 106 towards additional
school places. This is discussed further in Section 11.

8.16 LCC’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (publication February 2018) discusses the
need for new Primary School places in Lancashire. The document states the following:
The expansion, or where necessary the creation, of new primary schools in Bailrigg Garden Village, East Lancaster, North Lancaster and South Carnforth to deliver sufficient school places to meet projected needs and demand.

8.17 This suggests that there are no immediate plans to expand provision in Garstang. However, the planned development may necessitate it.

9.0 Secondary Schools

9.1 One school has been assessed for capacity data, as only one Secondary School resides within the 3-mile criteria beyond which local authorities are required to fund transport. This is shown in Map 9 below:

9.2 The current roll at the nearest school, Garstang Community Academy, is shown below in Table 13:
9.3 The school is south of Garstang, 1.8 miles from the development site. The school accepts 168 pupils per year group. The latest figures in the public domain for the school show that the school had capacity in every year group, although mainly focused in the higher year groups. The current roll at the school is 727 against a capacity of 840, meaning that there are 113 surplus places at the school.

9.4 According to LCC’s child yield, 113 surplus Secondary School places is the equivalent of 753 four-bed dwellings, or 1,256 three-bed dwellings.

9.5 When looking at the catchment area of the school, it is evident that there are not sufficient Secondary school pupils in Garstang to maintain the current numbers at the school, as the facility draws pupils from a very large catchment.
9.6 The school takes pupils from as far north as Lancaster (approximately 10 miles from the school) and as far south as Goosnargh (approximately 7.5 miles from the school). When taking away the pupils travelling quite a substantial distance to school every day, the capacity of the school increases even further, demonstrating that there is unlikely to be any circumstance where pupils from this development applying to attend Garstang Community Academy could not get a place.

9.7 When looking at the projections for Secondary, Garstang Community Academy is grouped with six other schools to make the ‘Wyre Secondary’ planning area. The seven schools have a combined capacity of 6,937:
9.8 LCC are projecting an increase of 601 pupils between 2016/17 and 2023/24, taking the total roll at the schools from 5,860 to 6,461. If the forecast number is met, as it stands the seven schools will still have available capacity equating to 476 places. This is the equivalent of over 3,000 new 4-bedroom houses.

9.9 Based on the Secondary assessment, there is sufficient capacity at the local school, and more in the system as a whole, to accommodate all of the dwellings currently with planning permission and coming forward through the planning system. Accordingly, any request from LCC for Secondary School planning obligations should be refuted as not fulfilling the tests of CIL, and therefore being unreasonable.

10.0 Neighbouring Developments

10.1 There are at least seven new housing developments in and in the vicinity of Garstang that have planning approval. This includes a site directly to the south of the proposed Cockerham Road development for 269 dwellings. There is a further 18 dwellings approved at Garstang Community Centre; 95 dwellings at Garstang Golf Club; and 49 dwellings at Calder House Lane, Bowgreave. Further south in Catterall is a recently approved development of 66 dwellings at Daniel Fold Farm. These developments’ approximate locations are shown in Map 11 below:
10.2 Slightly further afield is two approved planning applications in Barton, for 34 and 72 dwellings respectively, as demonstrated on Map 12:
10.3 The Barton developments will add extra pupils to the area as a whole but will not directly affect Garstang as they will feed into St Lawrence School in Barton. Similarly, the new development in Catterall will feed into Kirkland and Catterall St Helen’s CofE Primary School (this school has capacity in every group and can easily accommodate the additional development).

10.4 When looking at the expected child yield from the additional dwellings in and around Garstang, the additional number of Primary School pupils is 158. When adding this to the proposed development at Cockerham Road, the child yield will be between 196 and 261 (depending on the size of the development delivered). Some of this provision is already mitigated in the form of Section 106 obligations for ‘development off A6 Corridor’. Garstang Golf Course, for example, has a signed agreement with provision towards A6 development, and expansion of Broughton High School.

10.5 Should the highest number of pupils forecast wish to enter Garstang Primary Schools, there is some existing capacity (currently at 73 pupils), and some additional capacity that could be offset from making the schools more focused on the immediate area, pushing future pupils that live further away into schools in their localities. An additional expansion project of no more than 1fe would be required, and there are certainly options in Garstang to achieve this, such as Garstang Community Primary, which is on a very large site for its current offer.

10.6 From a Secondary School perspective, the child yield of the combined developments is between 77 and 103 Secondary School aged pupils (depending on the size of development delivered on Cockerham Road). As discussed, some of this impact has been mitigated through contributions towards Broughton High School (8.2 miles from this development). However, what is evident from this review, is that the local Secondary School could currently accommodate the whole forecast impact of the developments combined. This reinforces the fact that Section 106 contributions for Secondary Education are not warranted from this development.

11.0 Infrastructure Costs

11.1 LCC utilises cost multipliers for Primary and Secondary Education:

- Primary per place = £14,217.31
- Secondary per place = £21,423.27

11.2 Accordingly, depending on the quantum of development delivered, and dwelling size split, the expected contributions would equate to the following (should both be considered to be required):
• Primary = £14,217.31 x 38 Pupils = £540,257.78 (100 dwellings)
• Primary = £14,217.31 x 103 Pupils = £1,464,382.93 (270 dwellings)

• Secondary = £21,423.27 x 15 Pupils = £321,349.05 (100 dwellings)
• Secondary = £21,423.27 x 41 Pupils = £878,354.07 (270 dwellings)

11.3 As discussed previously, these figures are based on development of 100% 4-bed dwellings. The numbers will accordingly come down if there is a proportion of smaller dwellings.

11.4 The expected Secondary School figures are included for information only, as they are not considered to be a reasonable request based on the current and forecast capacity.

12.0 Early Years

12.1 Under the Childcare Act 2006, local authorities have specific duties to secure:

• Sufficient and suitable childcare places to enable parents to work, or to undertake education or training which could lead to employment
• Sufficient and suitable early years places to meet predicted demand
• Free early years provision for all 3 and 4-year olds (and more recently the 40% most vulnerable 2-year olds) of 15 hours per week 38 weeks per year.

12.2 The Childcare Act 2016 includes an extension to the current entitlement and, from September 2017, provides an additional 15 hours (per week 38 weeks per year) of free childcare for 3 and 4-year old children from working families who meet the following criteria:

• Both parents are working (or the sole parent is working in a lone parent family)
• Each parent earns, on average, a weekly minimum equivalent to 16 hours at national minimum wage and less than £100,000 per year.

12.3 LCC’s most recent Child Sufficiency Assessment published in 2016 states the following:

Data suggests Lancashire has a good spread of places across age groups, provider type and across all districts. Vacancy data suggests that there is childcare available across each age group within each district.
12.4 This states that there is no specific need for new provision in the LCC administrative area, and that accordingly no planning obligations are justified.

13.0 Special Education Needs

13.1 There is no precedent to refer to where LCC have requested Special Needs contributions from new developments. Additionally, it is very difficult to ascertain whether any children with SEN would come forward from this development. If direct need cannot be identified, then a planning obligation is not required. Any request for contributions towards SEN should be challenged.

14.0 Conclusion

14.1 It is not unreasonable for LCC to request Primary School contributions from this development towards an expansion project at one of the three Primary schools in Garstang.

14.2 It is however unreasonable for LCC to request funds towards any other Education-related infrastructure due to the lack of need for additional provision.