

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**



Ribble Valley  
Borough Council

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

**ISSUE 1 – LEGAL COMPLIANCE**

**RESPONSE TO ISSUES AND QUESTIONS ON BEHALF OF  
THE LOCAL AUTHORITY**

## ISSUE 1: LEGAL COMPLIANCE

**Has consultation been carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the relevant regulations; has the DPD been subject to Sustainability Appraisal; has a Habitats Regulation Screening Report been carried out and has the Duty to Co-operate been met?**

- a) Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with relevant legal requirements, including the Duty to Co-operate and the procedural requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework?

**Answer:** The Council has prepared the plan in accord with the legal requirements and has fulfilled the duty to Co-operate. Dealing with the Duty to Co-operate first, throughout the process of plan preparation, the Council has worked jointly with neighbouring authorities and statutory partners through specific joint projects by way of consultation and engagement in the preparation of the plan and in undertaking formal consultation through the plan making process which had led to the plan policies being developed and modified to address concerns or to recognise particular issues of interest for these partner organisations. The Council has provided evidence to demonstrate how it has complied with the Duty to Co-operate in its response to the Inspector (*Post 2.10*). The Duty to Co-operate is an on-going matter for the Council and work on this continues following submission work. The Council has prepared its plan in accordance with the legal requirements and our published evidence provides information in support of this.

The production of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which meets the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive is a legal requirement for the plan. The requirement for this is identified in the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012<sup>1</sup> and the SEA requirement is identified in The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SI 2004 No. 1633). An SA that meets the requirements of the SEA Directive has been undertaken upon and throughout the plan production. The Council has used a detailed process of Sustainability Appraisal including meeting and addressing the requirements of the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) with the process managed by external consultants<sup>2</sup>. This has been in relation to allocations options development, and specific policy development that was fed in throughout the process to ensure that the plan has been appraised and shaped in the most appropriate manner. A series of publications have been produced that demonstrate how the regulations have been met and set out the process undertaken including consultation and engagement with statutory bodies and the public. These documents are included in the document library (*Supp 1.29, Supp 1.30, Supp 1.32*) In addition the relevant committee reports are included in the report compendia within this library. The Council also holds extensive files relating to the preparation of the SA consultation events undertaken and the processes followed.

---

<sup>1</sup> As amended by The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2016

<sup>2</sup> Arcadis Consulting (UK) Ltd.

- b) Is the Plan in general conformity with the NPPF? Does it reflect the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development?

**Answer:** The DPD is consistent with the principles and policies set out in NPPF (*Supp 1.1*), including the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It is considered that the DPD, in combination with the adopted Core Strategy, provides clear policies on what will (and will not) be permitted and where. In ensuring the plan is consistent with the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the economic, social and environmental dimensions have been considered. The potential significant impacts on these three dimensions has been considered in depth within the SA/SEA/HRA testing process. In addition, there has been early, meaningful and continued consultation, the outcomes of which have been clearly documented (*Supp 1.35*) and it has been demonstrated how the consultation responses have shaped the DPD throughout its evolution. The HED DPD is the 'daughter document' of the Core Strategy which sets the overall strategic context for the borough and has been found 'sound' and is now adopted. In passing through the Examination in Public process and being found sound the Core Strategy has therefore been found to be in conformity with NPPF, which itself, forms part of the overall Development Plan for the borough.

- c) Is the Plan consistent with the Core strategy and is it capable of meeting its objectives?

**Answer:** The adopted Core Strategy represents the overall strategic plan for the borough. It sets out the Development Strategy, as well as specific thematic policies and Development Management policies. The Core Strategy was found sound and adopted in December 2014 and the HED DPD sits within the overall framework as the 'daughter document' to the Core Strategy. It contains relevant allocations, including housing and employment land and policies for the town centres of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley, as well as existing open spaces and draft settlement boundaries, which are necessary for the implementation of the Core Strategy. The HED DPD is in complete conformity with the adopted Core Strategy and subsequently (in combination with the Core Strategy) the nine strategic objectives which underpin the Council's approach.

- d) Are appropriate arrangements in place to ensure proper monitoring of the Plan?

**Answer:** Chapter 11 of the adopted Core Strategy provides a comprehensive monitoring framework, against which the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) (*Post 2.4*) provides an annual update report, however a number of these indicators are monitored more regularly and reported on a more frequent basis (such as the Housing Land Monitoring schedule for example, the most recent of which is the October 2017 Housing Land Availability Schedule (*Post 2.3*)).

The final section of the HED DPD (page 25 of *Supp 1.26*) provides information on monitoring. To reiterate the information set out in this section, the intention is to use the Core Strategy monitoring framework to monitor all policies within the

Local Development Framework (LDF), which allows for a comprehensive monitoring overview to be implemented through the AMR, and to take account of the Local Plan review timetabled to begin in 2018 (as set out in the 2017 LDS *Post 2.2*).

e) How have the Housing Needs Assessment and Economic Strategy which formed part of the Core Strategy evidence base informed this DPD?

**Answer:** In considering the 'Housing Needs Assessment', the Council has produced a significant volume of evidence in preparing the LDF, which has informed both the adopted Core Strategy and also the HED DPD. The overall Housing Needs Assessment therefore encompasses the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (*Supp 1.15*), Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (*Supp 1.16*), Ribble Valley Housing Requirement update (*Supp 1.7*) and Housing Land Availability Monitoring Schedules (*Supp 1.24, Post 2.3 etc*).

In moving forward from the Strategic context of the Core Strategy, to the allocations and information included within the HED DPD, updates on housing numbers have been necessary.

HLA- This monitors the completions and permissions and residual requirements for both Housing and Employment land in the borough, providing an updated position on the information contained within the defining a local housing requirement. The most recent HLA is *Post 2.3*.

SHLAA- the SHLAA has been used to collate a comprehensive list of sites for both housing and economic development land from which a number of the potential allocation sites were formulated. These were initially presented as part of a topic paper and then presented at Regulation 18 Issues and Options stage HED DPD (*Post 2.6*). Work on refining these allocations took place and is set out in detail in the Approach to plan preparation document (*Supp 1.39*) which was presented to Planning and Development Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017 (*Post 2.5*) and resulted in the Regulation 19 Publication stage HED DPD (*Supp 1.28*) and subsequently the Regulation 22 document (*Supp 1.26*).

Defining a Local Housing Requirement<sup>3</sup> (*Supp 1.7*)- This report sets out the overall number of houses required in the borough over the LDF plan period (2008-2028) and breaks this down into an annual requirement of 280 units a year. The bi-annual HLA monitoring keeps the number of completions and permissions against this up to date and also sets out the remaining residual requirement for each of the settlements (as per the Development Strategy) until the end of the plan period. This is an essential element of the monitoring framework to ensure that the Development Strategy is appropriately implemented.

The Economic Strategy, as part of the Core Strategy evidence base, outlines the Council's economic aims and objectives and is articulated through the Corporate Strategy and the Core Strategy, having previously been the subject of a separate and detailed Economic Strategy document.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ribble Valley Housing requirement Update 2013 (*Supp 1.7*)

Since the production of the Economic Strategy, the Council has produced a significant volume of further evidence in preparing the LDF, which has helped both inform the Core Strategy (adopted in Dec 2014) and also the HED DPD. The broader Economic Strategy therefore runs alongside the Employment Land Study Refresh (*Supp 1.12*), the Retail Study (*Supp 1.13*) and Leisure Study (*Post 2.16*).

A number of core elements have been focused upon in order to set this at the heart of council policy and to embed its economic objectives and priorities within the Corporate Strategy (*Post 2.7*), Development Plan (*Supp 1.6*) and Community Strategies.

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**



Ribble Valley  
Borough Council

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

**ISSUE 2 – HOUSING**

**RESPONSE TO ISSUES AND QUESTIONS ON BEHALF OF  
THE LOCAL AUTHORITY**

## ISSUE 2: HOUSING

**Whether the Council's strategy for meeting its housing requirement is sound and whether the housing policies of the DPD are consistent with, and positively promote, the visions, objectives and spatial policies contained in the Core Strategy.**

- a) Is the amount of land allocated for housing sufficient to meet the Core Strategy requirements?

**Answer:** The Core Strategy sets out the overall requirement for housing land of 5,600 units over the plan period (2008-2028). As discussed within Issue 1 (question 1d) regular monitoring, in particular the bi-annual Housing Land Availability Schedule (HLA) (*Supp 1.24, Post 2.3 etc*), provides consistent updates in relation to progress on commitments against this figure. As is evident in the HED DPD (and in the previous iterations Reg 18 (*Post 2.6*), Reg 19 document (*Supp 1.28*) as well as the Approach to Plan Preparation document (*Supp 1.39*) and the initial topic papers (*Post 2.8*) there only remains a small remaining requirement (see 'justification' in section 2, page 8 of the HED DPD (*Supp 1.26*)). This sets out how there only remains a very small requirement in the principal settlement of Longridge and Tier One settlement's of Mellor and Wilpshire.

As set out on page 9 of *Supp 1.26*, in the case of Longridge, it was anticipated that the residual requirement would have been met (as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017) due to resolutions made by the Council at Planning and Development Committee, subject to the completions of Section 106 agreements. Updated monitoring at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017 (*Post 2.3*) shows that the residual requirement in this settlement has now been met as expected (and exceeded by 257 units). Therefore a residual requirement which requires addressing, now only remains in Mellor and Wilpshire (for 16 and 29 units respectively- see *Post 2.3*). Policy HAL1 and HLA2 therefore addresses the remaining requirement.

In relation to HAL1 (Land at Mellor) it was acknowledged in the HED DPD (*Supp 1.26*) on page 11 that meeting the residual requirement on the site may result in a high density scheme and that if the density is considered too intensive then the remaining requirement for the settlement will need to be met through windfall development during the plan period. It is considered that there is adequate land in the settlement (as evidenced by the land availability in the SHLAA document (*Supp 1.16*) to meet what would be a residual requirement (if any) once site HAL1 has been committed.

In relation to HAL2 (Land at Wilpshire) it is considered that the site is large enough to comfortably meet the remaining requirement for Wilpshire at any density.

Therefore, the amount of land allocated for housing in the HED DPD is sufficient to meet the Core Strategy requirements.

b) Is there a housing trajectory for the delivery of housing on the strategic site and the principal settlements? 1040 dwellings are identified for Standen over the plan period where will the remainder of the housing requirement be provided?

**Answer:** The overall housing requirement and distribution is set out in the adopted Core Strategy (Policy DS1 of the Core Strategy (Supp 1.6). Paragraph 4.12 on page 42 of the Core Strategy sets out the proposed distribution across the Principal settlements, Tier 1 settlements and Tier 2 settlements (as per the Policy DS1). Regular HLA monitoring since the production of this table has therefore provided the opportunity to keep the information in this table up to date and ensure that the strategy is being delivered as it should be, without harm.

To reiterate the information contained in the table at 4.12 of the Core Strategy, but by way of an update as at the Council's most recent monitoring position, the following table indicates where the housing requirement was proposed to be delivered across the borough (column A) and where this has taken place (column B and column C).

Settlement	Total dwellings required 2008-28 A	Dwellings built 2008 – 30 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2017 B	Dwellings with pp at 30 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2017 C	Residual at 30 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2017 A-(B+C) 0 indicates requirement already met	Permissions granted 1/10/17 onwards – net additions only	Interim residual at 6/11/17
<i>Principal Settlements</i>						
Clitheroe	2320 of which 1040 = Strategic site leaving: 1280	682	1698	0 (-60)	Clitheroe Hospital 3/2017/0616 (+60) Union St 3/2017/0573 (+36) Both awaiting S106, considered at P&D 26/10	-156 (provisional awaiting completion of S106's)
Longridge	1160 (less 200 Longridge adj =960	279	938	0 (-257)		
Whalley	520	165	385	0 (-30)		
<i>Strategic Site</i>						
Standen	1040	0	1040	0		



Settlement	CS Total dwellings required 2008-28	Dwellings built 2008 – 30 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2017	Dwellings with pp at 30 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2017	PP's granted previously outside/adj. SB that could contribute to residual	Residual at 30 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2017	Permissions granted 1/10/17 onwards – net additions only	Interim residual at 6/11/17
<i>Tier 1 Settlements</i>							
Barrow	710	189	521 includes 43 on former Hansons nursery site		0		
Billington	76	53	40		0 (-17)		
Chatburn	27	7	19		1		
Gisburn	16	30	11		0 (-25)		
Langho	21	2	22		0 (-3)		
Mellor	38	19	2	Former public conveniences Mellor Lane 3/2016/0619 (+1)	16		
Mellor Brook	23	2	17	land at Whalley Road 3/2015/0313 (+4) and 3/2016/0843 (+1)	0 (-1)		
Read & Simonstone	45	17	24	3/2104/0751 approved 8 Hammond Drive (+1)	3		
Wilpshire	66	19	18		29		

Barrowlands approvals (225+183 dwellings as at RM approvals) (504) are now counted in the requirement for Barrow settlement. Barrow became a parish in its own right from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015  
CS Residual figures calculated on basis of approvals/completions within defined DWLP settlement boundaries. The residual figures were adopted in Jan 2015. Any permissions which were granted before that would be taken in to account in calculating the residual requirements. If pp existed before that point it is important not to double count it e.g. if an amended scheme or RM app is submitted. For example recent approval 3/2014/0618 for 10 dwellings at Chatburn relates to similar scheme allowed on appeal 3/2011/0025 so figures already in the system. Only net changes to overall figures should be included

Housing land monitoring used revised settlement boundaries as shown on Reg 19 proposals map (*Supp 1.33*) which accompanies HED DPD. Revised boundaries adopted for DM purposes Dec 2016.

PP's- Planning Permissions

SB- Settlement Boundaries

In addition, the Core Strategy also includes a 'Housing supply and trajectory' on page 177 and 178 (Supp 1.6), illustrating anticipated delivery over the plan period. Whilst the Council do not hold an updated graphical representation of this trajectory, the previous tables provide this information.

- c) Will the distribution, capacity and speed of deliverability (with regard to viability and infrastructure) of the sites, including those allocated in the DPD and the Standen strategic site, satisfy the provision of a 5 year housing land supply?

**Answer:** Yes. Current evidence (*Post 2.3 and Post 2.9*) indicates that extant permissions, the strategic Standen site and the proposed HED DPD allocations together sufficiently address the Core Strategy development strategy DS1 housing requirement in terms of its spatial distribution and capacity in terms of various settlements' quanta of housing. On-going and regularly updated monitoring (*Post 2.3*) shows that, using the Council's adopted housing supply methodology outlined below, the deliverability of sites is above housing trajectory requirements and is also unhindered by viability or infrastructure concerns and that the authority has a robust five year supply of 5.9 years<sup>4</sup>.

### **The Council's Approach to Calculating a Five Year Supply**

The Council has a robust housing supply calculation underpinned by up to date monitoring which is described below. The initial calculation approved by the Planning Inspectorate at the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2014 incorporated sites with planning permission and signed Section 106 agreements. It then discounted undeliverable sites and included a 10% slippage figure on all sites. Due to the then (December 2014) position of historic under- delivery a 20% buffer was added to the requirement only but not to the backlog. The Council adopted the Sedgefield method to make up this shortfall.

The above methodology was slightly amended in February 2015 (Planning and Development Committee 12/2/15) to include a windfall allowance and an application of a 10% discount to housing sites which had not commenced at any monitoring date.

In April 2017 a Special Planning and Development Committee met on 6/4/17 to consider in house research on a variety of Planning Inspectorate reports at EIPs elsewhere in the country into where exactly to apply the buffer mentioned above in 2014, after considering this information the Council decided to modify further its approach to take into account the Inspectorate's collective current position which was to apply the buffer to the housing requirement plus the backlog. The Council's methodology was therefore amended (*Post 2.11*) to take this into account.

In June 2017 at the Planning and Development Committee 12/6/17, the Council resolved to use a 5% buffer in line with the Government's proposal of a Housing Delivery Test within the Housing White Paper "Fixing our Broken Housing Market" published in February 2017 (*Post 2.12*). The White Paper stated that a

---

<sup>4</sup> As set out in Housing Land Availability Schedule - October 2017 (*Post 2.3*).

5% buffer would apply where local delivery has exceeded annualised average requirements for 3 consecutive years. As mentioned below this has been the case in Ribble Valley since 2014. It should be noted that, as an alternative, should the 20% buffer be retained the Council can still demonstrate a five year supply as of 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017 (*Post 2.3*), however the Council consider based on evidence that this buffer should be 5%, not 20%.

### **Council's Housing Monitoring**

The Council has a detailed, publicly available and regularly updated housing monitoring system comprising several elements set out below. This is the data that the above methodology uses.

The Council regularly monitors its housing land position through its publicly available Housing Land Availability Schedule (HLAS) which it produces twice yearly on the positions as of March 31<sup>st</sup> (published in April) and September 30<sup>th</sup>, published in October 2017 (*post 2.3*). This document sets out in great detail the position of all extant planning permissions, including the housing trajectory position from the beginning of the Core Strategy plan period; the detailed distribution of completions by parish and settlement and the current 5 year supply position for 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017.

The latest Housing Land Availability Schedule position as of 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017 (*Post 2.3*), indicates a 5.9 year supply. In addition it also shows that annual delivery rates for the last three full years 2014-2015, 2015 - 2016 and 2016 - 2017 have been above the average annualised plan period figure of 280 units (5600 units over the plan period of 20 years (2008 to 2028) indicating a satisfactory deliverability rate.

Also various housing land statistics, including the housing trajectory (Section 3) and the Standen Strategic site (Section 6) are included within the publicly available Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) on the Core Strategy. The latest published AMR relates to the year 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 and was published in August 2017 (*Post 2.4*).

Also, for Development Management purposes, the Council updates its housing position on a weekly basis through an internal survey of the latest permission position as a short term check on the fulfilment of the various residual requirements set out in Core Strategy Policy DS1.

In addition the Council regularly liaises with developers over their forward plans, especially regarding the phasing of larger sites, including the Standen strategic site. Such responses are kept within internally held files, however an update position is provided in *Post 2.9*.

As of 30<sup>th</sup> September the Council had permitted 5967 dwellings against a requirement of 5600 units and had completed 2011. The Council keeps all extant permissions under review. In addition it regularly contacts developers as to their anticipated phasing of larger developments and builds these into its regular 5 year supply calculations.

## **Distribution and Capacity and Deliverability**

As stated above extant planning permissions, the Standen Strategic site and the proposed allocations in the HED DPD are directed towards collectively achieving the distributions and quanta of housing development set out in the adopted Core Strategy policy DS1 (Core Strategy pages 37–44, *Supp 1.6*) directing growth to the area's more sustainable settlements, the three Principal Settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and the Tier 1 smaller settlements. In addition, as a Borough- wide strategic housing site, the Core Strategy (Pages 81 – 83 of *Supp 1.6*) has allocated land at Standen to the south east of, and in close proximity to, Clitheroe, the area's largest and most sustainable settlement. The above monitoring information collectively sets out the position of each settlement in terms of both completions and extant permissions in relation to their individual housing requirements in Core Strategy Policy DS1 i.e. that sufficient distribution and capacity have been achieved. The information also indicates that sites are deliverable and are coming forward to completion at a sufficient pace to maintain a valid five year supply.

## **Viability**

The Core Strategy's policies were subjected to a Full Plan Viability Assessment (*Post 2.13*) and found to be NPPF compliant in the Core Strategy EIP. These policies have subsequently been applied with full weight since the adoption of the Core Strategy (in December 2014). Experience of applying these policies within the Council's Development Management system since 2014 has not indicated any major viability concerns that would inhibit the deliverability of sites, with open book viability assessments being analysed through the Local District Valuation system. As an indication of this the provision of affordable housing within Section 106 negotiations held using plan policies has been broadly in line with policy expectations with 561 affordable completions from 2011 total completions in the plan period thus far.

As mentioned above the Council also regularly liaises with developers to anticipate any future potential changes to phasing and general deliverability (see *Post 2.9*).

## **Infrastructure**

The general issues of infrastructure provision that would flow from the housing distribution and various quanta of development within each of the area's settlements was addressed through the Core Strategy EIP. In general infrastructure providers were able to indicate through their responses that the Core Strategy's development strategy set out in Policy DS1 was sustainable and did not present any insurmountable problems for future infrastructure provision over the plan period.

As a part of its evidence base for the HED DPD and to fulfil a Core Strategy EIP requirement the Council has produced an updated Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (*Supp 1.34*) which was a part of the HED DPD consultations and which set out the general infrastructure position within the Borough and also the latest information on the likely infrastructure requirements of each of the HED DPD proposed allocation sites. It also includes infrastructure requirements stemming from the Standen strategic site, such as the Pendle Road junction works. It re-

emphasises the general point made above that infrastructure providers do not anticipate any inability to provide for the expected impacts of the growth set out in the Core Strategy. Section 4 of the Schedule sets out the infrastructure position in relation to each of the various potential HED DPD allocation sites. Due to the limited need for allocations given the large extent of existing permissions it states that, "it is anticipated that the HED DPD will generate relatively few demands on infrastructure."

It also sets out in Section 5 an Infrastructure Schedule that breaks down both capital and section 106 contributions provision across the area's settlements.

- d) Does the plan make provision for addressing inclusive design and accessible environments issues in accordance with paragraphs 57, 58, 61 and 69 of NPPF?

**Answer:** The plan does make provision for addressing inclusive design and accessible environments as set out in the stated NPPF paragraphs. In general it is anticipated that the future development of the allocated sites within the HED DPD will be adequately controlled in relation to the issues within relevant NPPF paragraphs 57, 58, 61 and 69 through policies in the NPPF compliant adopted Core Strategy of 2014.

More specifically in relation to the above individual NPPF paragraphs the most relevant individual Core Strategy policies are attached below.

***NPPF paras 57 and 58: High quality and inclusive design.***

*Policy DMG1 General Considerations states that, in terms of design all proposals should "be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 Building in Context Principles (from the CABE/English Heritage "Building in Context" toolkit); be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials; consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. Particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character as well as the effects of development on existing amenities; use sustainable construction methods; the Lifetime Homes, or any subsequent equivalent standards should be incorporated into schemes."*

***Quality of design over the lifetime of the development***

*Key Statement EN2 in relation to development in the AONB and wider landscape – "development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials".*

### **Strong sense of place**

*Key Statement EN2 in relation to development in the AONB and wider landscape – “ development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials”.*

*See also DMG1 in relation to design above.*

### **Optimisation of the potential of the site to accommodate development, sustain appropriate mix of uses, incorporate green spaces and support local facilities and transport networks**

*Key Statement H2 in relation to “delivering a suitable mix of housing that accords with the projected future household requirements and local need...”*

*Key Statement EC2 – “proposals that have an adverse impact on existing community facilities would only be permitted as an exception where the proposed development would bring defined and demonstrable benefits”*

*In relation to the incorporation of greenspaces in new development Open Space is a priority within Planning Obligations policy DMI 1*

*Key Statement DMI2 Transport Considerations states that “New development should be located to minimise the need to travel. It should incorporate good access by foot and cycle and have convenient links to public transport to reduce the need to travel by private car.*

*In general schemes offering opportunities for more sustainable means of transport and sustainable travel improvements will be supported.”*

*Policy DMG3 Transport and Mobility states that. “In making decisions the Local Planning Authority will....attach considerable weight to the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development.”*

*The policy goes on to relate this to the primary and strategic route network ; provision made for access to development by pedestrian, cyclist and those with reduced mobility; developments located within already developed areas which are highly accessible to those without a car and proposals which strengthen existing town and village centres which offer everyday community shopping and other opportunities.. All major proposals to offer opportunities for increased use of, or improved provision of, bus and rail facilities.*

*DMB5 Footpaths and Bridleways states that the Council will protect the existing network and where it may become less attractive due to surrounding development require compensatory enhancements that lead to a net improvement in provision.*

*Policy DMB4 Open Space Provision states that, "On all residential sites over 1 hectare the layout will be expected to provide adequate and usable public open space. On a site by site basis the Council will also negotiate for provision on smaller sites...."*

### **Respond to local character and history**

*Key Statement EN2 in relation to development in the AONB and wider landscape – "development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials". ,*

*Policy DMH3 Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB and Policy DMH4 the Conversion of Barns and Other Buildings to Dwellings emphasise that structures should be of appropriate design and location including the consideration of character and appropriate materials*

### **Create safe and accessible environments**

*Policy DMG1 General Considerations states that all proposals should, "ensure that safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated."*

### **Be visually attractive**

This is dealt with in a variety of ways in the policies quoted above.

### **NPPF para 61**

#### **Going beyond architecture and appearance of individual buildings to connections between people and places.**

Going beyond the aesthetic and visual appearance of individual buildings, in terms of the connections people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment mentioned in this paragraph, in addition to the policies already quoted above, the authority has and continues to focus on connecting new development to individual settlements. The HED DPD housing and employment allocations all relate closely to individual settlements, in conformity with Core Strategy policy DS1. The strategic housing site at Standen is a well-integrated urban extension to Clitheroe, controlled through planning permission conditions and obligations, that is well connected to local services in the town centre and with additional facilities, such as school provision, within the site. These will help new comers to become a part of the wider community. Other allocations are similarly well connected to local services within established communities, in line with general sustainability criteria and confirmed by the Sustainability Appraisal evidence (Supp 1.29).

## **NPPF para 69**

### **Opportunities for meeting through mixed use developments, neighbourhood centres and active street frontages.**

Key Statement DS1 directs development towards existing sustainable settlements that offer better opportunities for mixed use development and access to neighbourhood centres and the potential for active street frontages.

### **Safe and accessible environments**

Policy DMG1 General Considerations states that all proposals should "ensure that safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated."

### **Safe and accessible developments, clear and legible pedestrian routes and high quality public space.**

- e) Are housing Allocation Policies HAL1 and HAL2 clear on what will and will not be permitted – for example housing numbers, tenure mix?

**Answer:** Section two 'Housing Allocations', sets out information on housing allocations HAL1 and HAL2 in terms of size, physical attributes, current usage and surrounding land uses. In terms of what will and will not be permitted, as is set out, the allocation restricts the future land use to housing however the detail of any application would be determined against the adopted Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and HED DPD together make up to the Local Plan and therefore policies and information included within the Core Strategy are not repeated within the HED DPD).

Information on the tenure mix, etc. that would be acceptable are included within policies H1, H2 and H3 as well as policies DMG1 and DMH1 and have been found Sound.

- f) Is the proposed monitoring likely to be adequate and what steps will be taken if sites do not come forward?

**Answer:** As discussed in section 1d and 2b, there is a monitoring system in place which closely monitors housing commitments and how these are being delivered, primarily through the HLA (doc).

However, it is anticipated that the sites will deliver the housing proposed as there is already interest in these sites. For example, see *Supp 1.36* which sets out a summary of the main issues raised at Publication Stage and *Supp 1.25*. In addition, the proven record of housing delivery in Ribble Valley indicates that the development of sites is not an area of concern due to the high rates of return available to developers in the Ribble Valley. On-going liaison with housebuilders and developers of the large housing sites in the borough (*Post 2.9*) provides updates on the delivery of all permitted sites in the borough. This also



illustrates that the delivery of housing sites in the Ribble Valley is not an area for concern. This is supported by the use of a 5% buffer in the 5-year housing land supply calculation as in accordance with para 47 of NPPF (page 12 of doc) which states that only where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing NPPF required that the buffer should be increased to 20% to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply (see Planning & Development Committee report - *Post 2.11*).

In addition, due to the time from the start of the plan period in 2008, to the full implementation of the adopted Core Strategy in December 2014, permissions and completions were taking place in accordance with the policy structure at that time (i.e. saved Districtwide Local Plan (DWLP) (*Post 2.14*) policies and NPPF) which in some instances varied from the emerging policies of the Core Strategy. As a result, a not-insignificant number of units were permitted and completed on land where the Core Strategy was not looking to direct it, but as this was prior to its adoption, the applications fitted with the policy position at that time. Therefore, as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017, there have been 5,967 residential units committed in the borough<sup>5</sup>, which is already over 350 units more than the overall requirement over the whole plan period. As a result, if the 45 units<sup>6</sup> in Mellor and Wilpshire did not come forward on the allocation sites, the overall planned requirement has in fact already been met.

g) How will the housing allocations in the DPD deliver the affordable housing set out in CS Policy H3?

**Answer:** The Council has already delivered, and continues to deliver affordable housing through a range of delivery mechanism including completions and commitments. The housing allocations in the DPD will be subject to the policy provisions of the Core Strategy. Policy H3 of the adopted Core Strategy provides the Council's affordable housing policy. In relation to the allocation sites, the Core Strategy policy provides the underpinning framework and states that "on developments of 5 or more dwellings (or sites of 0.2ha or more irrespective of the number of dwellings) the Council will require 30% affordable units on the site". The allocations for housing set out in the HED DPD will therefore contribute to the provision of affordable housing as the allocations are subject to compliance with the policies in the adopted Core Strategy. The Council will of course also continue to secure affordable housing units in accord with its exceptions policies contained in the Development Strategy and framework of the Core Strategy.

---

<sup>5</sup> 5,967 units of which 2,011 are completions and the remaining 3,956 are permissions (from 01/04/08- 30/09/17).

<sup>6</sup> 16 units remaining in Mellor and 29 units remaining in Wilpshire (at 30/09/17).

- h) Whether the allocation of 0 permanent and transit sites under Policy TV1 is robust and appropriate to meet the needs of the gypsy and travelling community over the plan period to 2028?

**Answer:** The Council is committed through adopted Core Strategy Policy H4 to identify as appropriate sites to meet Gypsy and Traveller needs based on the Council's Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA) of 2013, which is considered to remain a robust evidence base (*Supp 1.10*). This stated that (GTAA para 6.2) that there was zero extra pitch provision necessary but that there was "likely to be a need for at least 2 extra pitches in the period 2023 to 2028." As stated in the policy's explanation this level of need was considered too small to necessitate a formal allocation but rather that provision would be managed through the development management system should any application to extend local provision come forward and this was reflected in policy H4. This was considered to be appropriate and NPPF compliant within the adopted Core Strategy of December 2014.

Given the above, the initial considerations of provision within the HED DPD were that no formal allocations for Gypsy and Traveller sites were considered necessary. Following the publication of the updated Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015) (*Post 2.15*) and a response within the HED DPD Regulation 18 consultation from the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (NFGLG), (as explained in the Regulation 19 Publication Version of the HED DPD April 2017 document) it was considered that, while it continued to be the evidenced position that no allocation needed to be made, which the NFGLG appeared to agree with, there was a requirement to place in the HED DPD a policy setting a set of criteria that would help guide the provision of such sites through applications for permission via the development management system mentioned above in H4. These criteria are therefore set out in Traveller Sites Policy TV1. The Council considers that this is an appropriate and robust response to evidence and consultation responses received.

- i) How does the DPD sit with the aim under paragraph 50 of the NPPF to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities as well as the requirements under the Equalities Act 2010, the public Sector Equality Duty and the Human Rights Act 2008?

**Answer:**

The HED DPD creates sustainable, inclusive mixed communities by building upon (and being in compliance with) the adopted Core Strategy. Whilst the HED DPD document itself does not set out what the mix, size, type, tenure and range of housing will be on the sites or set policies for meeting affordable need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified, the HED DPD is the 'daughter document' of the overall strategic spatial Development Plan for the borough, the Core Strategy, which has been found compliant with NPPF and therefore adopted. The HED DPD does not introduce new strategic policy areas, instead building upon those areas set out in the Core Strategy. It is therefore considered NPPF compliant. At the

heart of NPPF are the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental (para 7 of NPPF *Supp 1.1*). Paragraph 50 of the NPPF states that LPAs should:

- plan for a mix of housing, based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities service families and people wishing to build their own homes);
- identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; and
- where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.

The Council meets this Duty through its process of policy preparation including consultation to inform its work. The Council's decision making process then provides the appropriate vehicle to ensure the Council has complied with its duties and responsibilities by requiring an assessment to be undertaken of the relevant legal and equality matters.

In considering and assessing the economic, social and environmental dimensions of the NPPF, the HED DPD has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (and Strategic Environmental Assessment) as well as Habitats Regulation Assessment (*Supp 1.32*). As stated at para 1.2 (page 1) of the HED DPD SA report, "SA is a process for assessing the social, economic and environmental impacts of a plan and aims to ensure that sustainable development is at the heart of the plan-making process". In ensuring the most appropriate option is taken forward, the SA assessed the HED DPD land allocations and their alternatives (see para 4.2, page 20 of *Supp 1.29*) and provides detailed information on the preferred sites options as well as the rejected alternative site allocations. The HED DPD policies were also assessed (para 4.3, page 28 of *Supp 1.29*) and an appraisal of the cumulative effects of the HED DPD undertaken to identify any cumulative and synergistic effects. In addition, the HRA report (*Supp 1.32*) assesses whether or not the Ribble Valley HED DPD is likely to result in significant effects upon one or more of the European sites (whether in isolation and/or in combination with other plans or projects). As stated in para 5.8.2 (page 44) of the HRA (*Supp 1.32*) "there would be no likely significant in combination effects on European sites as a result of the development of all of the employment, housing and preferred option allocation sites listed".

As stated by [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk), The Equality Act 2010 legally protects people from discrimination in the workplace and in wider society. Chapter 1 of this Act, discusses 'public sector equality duty', which means that public bodies have to

consider all individuals when carrying out their day-to-day work – in shaping policy, in delivering services and in relation to their own employees.

It also requires that public bodies have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination
- advance equality of opportunity
- foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities

In considering the Equality Act, in particular chapter 1, it is considered that the HED DPD takes all of these issues into account. For example, prior to each stage of consultation and subsequent submission, a report has been prepared for Planning and Development (P&D) committee for Members to consider and agree the recommendation (if appropriate). Section 6 of these P&D reports includes a Risk Assessment, one of which assesses 'Equality and Diversity'. No issues have been identified in the production of the HED DPD in relation to this issue and it is considered that the HED DPD sits with and complies with the Public Sector Equality Duty of the Equalities Act 2010.

Similarly, in respect of the Human Rights Act the Council's process to formulate policy and take decisions on all areas of its work and functions has to have regard to the Human Rights Act 2008. The need to have such regard is embedded in the Council's constitution (Article1, Part 1) as a principle that the Council works with regard to the law. By undertaking the preparation of the HEDPD in accord with the appropriate legislation, including opportunities for consultation and challenge the Council is satisfied that it complies with the provisions of the Human Rights Act.

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**



Ribble Valley  
Borough Council

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

**ISSUE 3 – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**RESPONSE TO ISSUES AND QUESTIONS ON BEHALF OF  
THE LOCAL AUTHORITY**

### ISSUE 3: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Whether the Council's strategy for accommodating economic development is sound and whether the economic development policies of the DPD are consistent with, and positively promote, the visions, objectives and spatial policies contained within the Core Strategy.**

- a) Will the DPD enable the aims of the Ribble Valley Core strategy 2008-2028 to be met in respect of economic development; how will the broad aims of Key Statement DS1 be met through the allocations of the DPD?

**Answer:** The Development Strategy as outlined within Key Statement DS1 of the Core Strategy states the locations where developments are intended to take place in order provide strategic employment opportunities within the Borough.

Both the Barrow Enterprise Site and the Samlesbury Enterprise Zone are highlighted here as the 2 main sites identified in the strategic context within the Plan. These sites aim to serve both Clitheroe and surrounding areas, and those commuting via the A59, with future employment and economic growth opportunities.

The additional allocations identified within the the Housing and Economic Development Plan (HED DPD) will also assist the aims of Key Statement DS1 to be achieved. These allocations have been identified to address the special needs for future employment growth within the Borough.

In recent years a number of key developments have taken place within the borough that have further contributed to local employment and economic growth which have been assessed in accordance with the Core Strategy policies to help continue to ensure that the minimum required level of land for economic development can be accommodated over the remainder of the plan period.

It is also considered that provision can be included within land at Standen to the south of Clitheroe as well as opportunities to bring other sites forward to protect the special distribution and choice of locations.

Also to help ensure the continued vitality and viability of Clitheroe as the main key settlement within the Borough, the Clitheroe Market site has also been identified to provide future retail and leisure opportunities also.

- b) Would the approach of allocating 3 sites provide flexibility and choice for employment land within the Borough?

**Answer:** The proposed allocations of the 3 sites are intended to make provision to meet the residual employment land requirements set out in the Core Strategy and are also measured against the overall requirement and spatial distribution of employment provision.

These allocations would not prevent further or alternative sites coming forward that would be compatible with the aims of the policies within the plan. In making these allocations the plan addresses the identified requirements of the Core

Strategy whilst also ensuring the delivery of necessary employment land to meet requirements for Longridge.

These additional allocations amount to 4ha of further employment land, and results in an overprovision against the identified remaining requirement of 1.6ha. The existing commitments of employment land in the Borough will also add to these additional allocations in order to provide sufficient flexibility of a choice of sites and locations to accommodate economic growth.

c) How do policies CMR1 and MCB sit with the Core Strategy in terms of the allocations suggested in Policy EC2?

**Answer:** The allocations for the provision of new convenience and comparison retail floor space, as specified within Core Strategy Key Statement EC2, was identified as part of the evidence base. The Ribble Valley Retail Study update produced in 2013 (*Post 1.13*) detailed these as minimum floor space requirements for the 3 key service centres within the Borough.

This was recommended in the Retail Study to help both avert the possibility of spend leakage, and to enhance and retain existing spend locally. The aims of key statement EC2 help to address such important factors towards maintaining the vitality and vibrancy of the 3 key service centres within the borough, ensuring that enhancement of the existing retail offer takes place.

This is particularly relevant in order to protect the availability of uses within the main centre of Clitheroe (Policy MCB1) as well as the main routes and thoroughfares leading to them. Policy MCB1 identifies the main Centre of Clitheroe where the applicable boundaries within which the Core Strategy policies will be implemented. Boundaries have been established to reflect the existing retail centres on the basis of the extent of retail and commercial town centre uses.

Policy CMR1 aims to address these principle aims further by identifying a strategic site of a suitable scale in order to address the future growth opportunities in terms of the provision of additional retail and leisure facilities against the increasing competition from other retail centres outside of the Borough. This is identified in the Core Strategy and the Clitheroe Town Centre Masterplan to support and enhance the long term vitality and viability of the town centre.

The development of retail, shops and community facilities and services as specified within Key Statement EC2 aims to support and enhance the vibrancy, consumer choice and vitality and unique character of the area's important retail and service centres of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley.

Proposals that have an adverse impact on existing community facilities would only be permitted as an exception where the proposed development would bring defined and demonstrable benefits. The council will if required also put in place detailed development plans as appropriate to provide a strategic framework to guide the future development of the centres and support appropriate sustainable growth.

d) Is monitoring adequate and what steps will be taken if sites do not come forward?

**Answer:** The regular review of the evidence base, the monitoring of wider contextual information and the monitoring of Core Strategy policies are key in assessing effectiveness of the plan. Sites with planning permissions for business development are monitored by the Council. If, on occasion, any particular site seems to be showing no signs of moving forward towards development, or an existing permission may lapse, contact can be made with either the site owners or the relevant land agent to discuss any particular issues in relation to this.

The Monitoring Indicators as set out within Section 11 of the adopted Core Strategy specify how this issue will be addressed. Monitoring plays a key role in measuring whether the Core Strategy is being delivered and whether its policies are effective.

Such monitoring is an important tool in measuring whether delivery of the Core Strategy is on course and enables us to consider whether any additional actions are needed to address any issues. The monitoring process also enables a picture of trends to be established over time, which may highlight emerging issues, which will inform the review of the plan.

The Council also keep under review the wider contextual issues national, regional and local levels, which may impact upon the Borough and the Core Strategy. This is essential as the Core Strategy covers a timescale of several years overall and therefore any changes regarding the general economic climate need to be monitored to consider if they could impact on the plan.



**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**



**Ribble Valley**  
**Borough Council**

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

**ISSUE 4 – POLICY OS1**

**RESPONSE TO ISSUES AND QUESTIONS ON BEHALF OF  
THE LOCAL AUTHORITY**

## ISSUE 4: POLICY OS1

### Is Policy OS1 clear, justified and consistent with national policy and will be effective?

- a) The policy differs very slightly from the wording of CS Policy DMB4. What is the justification for this minor change to the wording of the policy in the strategic plan?

**Answer:** In terms of open space adopted Core Strategy policy DMB4 Open Space Provision, in addressing the need to offer some protection to existing open space sites, stated in its final paragraph that, "It is important to protect existing recreational areas from development. Within defined settlements public recreational land will be identified on the Proposals Map".

The updated Proposals Maps, that are a part of the Examination of the HED DPD (*Supp 1.33*), revealed that there are some open space sites that are outside settlement boundaries. It was therefore considered important to clarify policy to extend the policy position within DMB4 to all open space sites, both those within and those outside settlement boundaries. This led to the re- wording of policy DMB4 in the form of HED DPD Policy OS1.

- b) Is Policy OS1 consistent with the Core Strategy and the NPPF?

**Answer:** Yes. The general position of protection of open spaces within the NPPF (within parts of Chapters 8 and 11) does not specifically indicate that such sites have to be within settlements and therefore the re- worded policy DMB4 Open Space Provision (HED DPD Policy OS1) is considered to be consistent with NPPF in protecting all such sites wherever they may be placed in relation to settlements.

The evidence underpinning the approach to the above policy of protecting the area's existing open spaces within the HED DPD lies within various documents, some of which were produced for the Core Strategy. These are the Local Infrastructure Plan April 2012 (*Post 2.17*) which takes a general view of infrastructure, including open spaces; the Ribble Valley Facilities Review (*Supp 1.20*), which focuses on need in relation to areas such as indoor recreation and sport pitches and makes recommendations for future provision. Since the Core Strategy adoption the Council has also produced a Playing Pitch Audit (*Post 2.18*) which sets out the condition of the local Football, Cricket and Rugby pitches.

- c) Is this policy specific to Housing and Economic Development which would justify its inclusion in this DPD?

**Answer:** Yes. Core Strategy policy DMB4 Open Space Provision states that public recreational land will be identified on the Proposals Map (*Supp 1.33*). The development of and consultations on the HED DPD has involved from its outset the production of updated Proposals Maps (*Supp 1.33*) which consider updated

information on a wide variety of matters. These concern such matters as open space and minerals safeguarding areas that, whilst going beyond strict definitions of housing and economic development matters, without which it would be practically difficult to adequately guide housing and employment related development into sustainable sites and not potentially impinge on existing open space sites, through the development management process. Therefore the new Proposals Maps are considered to be relevant to the HED DPD through their spatial expression of HED DPD policies.