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1. The Inspector has prepared this Schedule of Matters & Issues for Examination to guide and focus the discussion at the hearing sessions of the Examination into the soundness of the **Hyndburn Core Strategy & Accrington Area Action Plan** (AAP). It has been prepared using the Planning Inspectorate’s guidance on Soundness and Procedures\(^1\), having regard to the representations made to the Publication/Revised Publication versions of the Core Strategy and Accrington AAP, the evidence already submitted and the guidance in PPS12 (2008). All participants should be aware of this published guidance.

2. This Schedule lists the main topics and issues to be addressed, setting out several questions on which the Inspector invites responses from the participants. The Council is invited to respond on all matters, issues and questions listed, referring to information in the Submission and Supporting Documents, and Evidence Base (limited to 3000 words per Matter/Policy). Other participants should only respond on topics/issues relevant to points made in their original representation(s), without raising new issues, in statements of no more than 3000 words each. Participants may refer to information in earlier representations, but the Inspector only has copies of the representations made at Publication/Revised Publication stages. All representations/responses should include all the necessary evidence and supporting material. **All further statements should directly address relevant Matters & Issues for Examination** and should be received by the Programme Officer no later than Friday 26 August 2011.

3. Please note that the Inspector is unlikely to accept further/new information/evidence once the hearing sessions commence, since this could seriously disrupt the hearings and disadvantage the participants. **All material that participants wish to put before the Inspector or refer to at the hearings should be submitted by the deadline indicated.** Further statements (including written responses) are not required unless they relate to the soundness of the plans, as set out in the Schedule of Matters & Issues, and are essential to understand the original representation(s). Participants can rely on their original representation, but will not be able to extend the scope of the original points made.

4. Detailed agendas for the hearing sessions will be issued shortly before they commence, based on the Matters & Issues for Examination and the responses received. However, it is unlikely that the Inspector will introduce new issues or questions that do not arise from the topics and issues identified. Participants should let the Programme Officer know as soon as possible whether they wish to attend a particular hearing session. Normally, only those who seek some change to the plan are entitled to participate in the hearing sessions. Participants for each of the hearing sessions will be listed on the programme for the hearings.

5. The Examination will focus on the requirements of soundness set out in PPS12 (2008). The starting point is the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers is a sound plan. **Participants are expected to explain which aspect of the plan is unsound, why it is unsound and specify precisely how it should be altered, with detailed wording and clear evidence to support this course of action.**

6. As well as complying with the legal requirements, the plans have to be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. To be “justified”, it should be founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. To be “effective”, it should be deliverable, flexible and able to be monitored. The Examination will focus on these key requirements of soundness. The plans should also set out what and how much development is proposed, and where, when and how it will be provided.

---

\(^1\) Local Development Frameworks – Examining Development Plan Documents: Soundness Guidance [PINS; February 2010] and Procedure Guidance [PINS; August 2009]
7. This is a complete Schedule of Matters and Issues for the Examination. Not all matters and issues listed will be discussed at the hearing sessions; this will partly depend on who wishes to attend the hearings, and some matters will be dealt with by written responses. At present, it is likely that the main matters and issues to be discussed at the hearings will cover:

- **Spatial Development Strategy:**
  - Basis and justification for the Balanced Development Strategy, including alternative options considered and the implications for the Green Belt;

- **Economy and employment:**
  - Justification for the overall level of employment land, including:
    i. Existing and future provision of employment land, including deliverability of employment sites;
    ii. Spatial distribution, scale and broad locations of new employment devt.
  - Protection of existing employment sites;
  - Retail strategy, including hierarchy of centres and future retail provision;

- **Housing:**
  - Justification for the overall level and spatial distribution of new housing development, including:
    i. Existing and proposed housing provision (including SHLAA);
    ii. Balance between brownfield/greenfield development and regeneration;
    iii. Deliverability, phasing and mix of proposed housing development;
    iv. Windfalls and policy for development of residential gardens;
  - Affordable housing, including threshold, proportion and economic viability.

- **Other Thematic policies:**
  - Health, education and community facilities;
  - Greenspace and Green Infrastructure, nature conservation and biodiversity;
  - Sustainable development, climate change, renewable energy and flood risk;

- **Area-Based Policies,** including:
  - Accrington, including Huncoat (housing/Strategic Employment Site)
  - Great Harwood & Rishton
  - Knuzden and Whitebirk (Strategic Employment Site)

- **Other matters,** including:
  - Monitoring and Implementation.

- **Accrington Area Action Plan**
  - Extent of Primary Retail Area;
  - Spatial quarters, including sustainability of sites in flood risk areas;
  - Implementation and delivery of the strategy.

8. This Schedule of Matters and Issues is based on current national planning policies (as at 20 July 2011). The Secretary of State has already confirmed that Regional Strategies (including the North-West RSS) will be revoked (as part of the Localism Bill) and will no longer form part of the statutory development plan. However, a recent Court of Appeal judgement confirms that it would be unlawful for local planning authorities and inspectors to have regard to the proposal to abolish regional strategies, and for as long as the regional strategies continue to exist, any development plan documents must be in general conformity with the relevant regional strategy. Should further announcements be made about national/regional planning policy or the scope and nature of the examination, the agenda and content of the Matters and Issues for Examination may need to be amended.

9. Participants should be aware that the scope for making substantial or fundamental changes to the plans after they have been submitted to the Secretary of State is limited, particularly where they have implications for the sustainability appraisal, the consultation processes already undertaken, and the underlying strategy. **The Inspector will not be able to make a substantive change to the plans unless it relates to an issue that has been subject to proper procedures of community involvement and sustainability appraisal.** In the absence of clear evidence that such procedures have been carried out, the Inspector can only give limited consideration to such representations.

---

2 Parliamentary statement by Rt Hon Eric Pickles (Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government) [dated 6 July 2010]
3 Cala Homes (South) Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government [2011 EWCA Civ 639]
4 Local Development Frameworks – Examining Development Plan Documents: Procedure Guidance (Annex; p.38; ¶ 5) [Planning Inspectorate: August 2009]
A. HYNDBURN CORE STRATEGY

1. LEGAL & PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Key issues:

1.1 Has the Core Strategy been prepared in accordance with the current Local Development Scheme (LDS), including its timetable, content and timescale?

1.2 Has the Core Strategy been prepared to comply with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement, allowing for effective engagement of all interested parties and meeting the minimum consultation requirements set out in the Regulations?

1.3 Has the Core Strategy been subject to Sustainability Appraisal, including a final report on the published plan; and is it clear how the Sustainability Appraisal influenced the final plan and dealt with mitigation measures? Has Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Directive/Regulations been carried out to the satisfaction of Natural England?

1.4 Does the Core Strategy have regard to national planning policy, and is there sufficient local justification for any policies that add nothing to, or are not consistent with, national planning policy?

1.5 Is the Core Strategy in general conformity with the approved North-West Regional Spatial Strategy (NWRSS), and are there any issues arising from the Secretary of State’s statement announcing that the Government intends to abolish Regional Strategies, along with the recent Court of Appeal judgement, and any subsequent Ministerial statement(s) on planning/housing policy issued before the hearing sessions commence?

1.6 Does the Core Strategy have regard to the Hyndburn Sustainable Community Strategy, and aligned its key spatial planning objectives with the priorities identified in this strategy?

1.7 Does the Core Strategy comply with the Local Development Regulations (as amended), in terms of publishing and making available the prescribed documents?

1.8 Does the Core Strategy make sufficient reference to and take account of other plans and strategies of the Council and other agencies, including the plans of adjoining local planning authorities (eg. Pennine Lancashire Multi-Area Agreement/Spatial Strategy, Economic Strategy, Housing Strategy, Blackburn with Darwen Core Strategy, Lancashire Minerals & Waste Development Framework, housing renewal programmes, Local Transport Plans, etc)?

---

5 Most of these issues should be covered in the Council’s Legal Compliance Self-Assessment [CS_Sub1.9]
7 Detailed aspects of consistency with national policy will be dealt with under later topics and issues
8 Detailed aspects of conformity with regional policy will be dealt with under later topics and issues
9 Letter from Rt Hon Eric Pickles MP (Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government) to all local authorities (dated 27 May 2010; DCLG)
10 Cala Homes (South) Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government [2011 EWCA Civ 639]
2. VISION AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

*Key issue:*
*Are the Vision and Strategic Objectives soundly based and appropriate for Hyndburn, consistent with national policies, reflecting community views and locally distinctive, and do they provide a sound basis for the overall spatial strategy and strategic policies in the Core Strategy?*

2.1 Does the Vision:

a. clearly set out the vision for the future strategy and spatial pattern of development in Hyndburn over the plan period?

b. contain sufficient local and spatial distinctiveness, reflecting key elements and local issues relevant to Hyndburn, including the vision and priorities of the Sustainable Community Strategy & Local/Multi Area Agreements?

2.2 Objectives:

a. Does the Core Strategy contain clear, specific and locally distinctive objectives, which reflect the full range of key issues and objectives relevant to the implementation of the Core Strategy?

b. Is the relationship between the identified issues and the objectives sufficiently clear, and is it clear how the policies and spatial interventions will meet the objectives?

c. Should any of the objectives be amended to reflect relevant concerns raised in the representations?

3. SPATIAL STRATEGY – A BALANCED DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

*Key issue:*
*Is the Spatial Strategy soundly based, effective and deliverable, appropriate for Hyndburn, supported by a robust and credible evidence base, and consistent with national policy?*

3.1 Balanced Development Strategy

a. Is the Spatial Strategy clearly expressed and soundly based on a robust, credible and up-to-date evidence base, consistent with national planning policy and aligned with the strategies, priorities and projects of adjoining areas and other agencies (eg. Pennine Lancashire Multi-Area/Local Area Agreements/Spatial Strategy etc, Blackburn with Darwen Core Strategy, housing renewal programmes, and other relevant strategies)?

b. Is the Balanced Development Strategy the most appropriate and sustainable option for Hyndburn when considered against reasonable alternatives?

b. Should the Balanced Development Strategy be set out in the form of an over-arching strategic policy to provide the context for the thematic policies which follow?

b. Does the Balanced Development Strategy give sufficient strategic guidance and spatial direction about the scale, location, timing and implementation of new development, in order to guide subsequent Development Plan Documents and development decisions?

b. Are the main elements of the Balanced Development Strategy justified, effective, deliverable and soundly based, particularly in terms of providing the proposed amount of housing and employment development, and recognising the environmental, physical and traffic/transport constraints to development?

b. Does the Spatial Strategy appropriately reflect the Vision and Strategic Objectives and adequately address cross-boundary issues?

b. Is the Spatial Strategy sufficiently flexible to respond to a variety of unexpected or changing circumstances in the future?

b. Does the Key Diagram properly illustrate the main elements of the Spatial Strategy, including the future pattern of development (including proposed employment and housing development), the hierarchy/role of centres and the general extent of, and changes to, the Green Belt boundary?
4. **ECONOMY & EMPLOYMENT**  
(Policies E1-E2)

**Key issue:**  
Are the strategy and policies for the economy and provision of employment land soundly based, effective, deliverable and appropriate for Hyndburn, supported by a robust, credible and up-to-date evidence base, and consistent with national policy?

4.1 **Future Employment Provision (Policy E1)**

a. Is the strategy for providing employment land soundly based, up-to-date, justified and supported by evidence, including the Employment Land Study and Annual Monitoring Reports; and does it reflect national policy and other economic strategies (e.g. Pennine Lancashire Economic Strategy)?

b. What is the basis, methodology and justification for the overall level of proposed employment land provision, and is it soundly based and justified with evidence (including the Employment Land Study)?

c. What is the existing and proposed employment land provision, and how will the proposed provision be delivered within the plan period?

d. Does the policy and accompanying text give sufficient guidance about the amount, location, timing and provision of additional employment land to guide subsequent DPDs and enable the potential impact of development to be properly assessed?

e. What are the implications of the recent government statement on "Planning for Growth" for the Core Strategy, and how will it help to implement this policy?

4.2 **Protection, Modernisation and Development of Employment Sites (Policy E2)**

a. What is the basis and criteria for considering alternative uses of existing employment sites, and is it supported by evidence and consistent with national policy, particularly in terms of the requirement for marketing?

b. Should the employment policies be widened to encompass other sources of employment, such as in the retail and service sectors?

c. Should Junction 7 Business Park be identified as a major industrial estate, and is the strategy for this site consistent with the Pennine Lancashire MAA/Spatial Strategy?

4.3 **Retail and town centre development**

a. Does the Core Strategy include sufficient strategic guidance and spatial direction for new retail and town centre development, having regard to the national guidance in PPS4?

b. What is the basis and justification for the hierarchy of centres?

---

5. **HOUSING**  
(Policies H1-H3 & A1/GH1/R1)

**Key issue:**  
Does the Core Strategy make appropriate provision for the effective delivery of new housing in Hyndburn, including the overall provision of new housing, the scale and distribution of new housing growth, affordable housing and provision for gypsies and travellers, having regard to national policy, and is it fully justified and supported by an up-to-date, credible and robust evidence base?

5.1 **Overall provision of Housing**

a. What is the basis and justification for the overall level of proposed housing provision, having regard to the evidence base in the NW Regional Spatial Strategy and any subsequent population and household projections, and the guidance in PPS3 (¶ 33)?

b. Should Policy H1 be amended to indicate the overall level of housing provision?

c. Do the policies and accompanying text give sufficient guidance about the amount, location and timing of new housing development, consistent with national policy?

d. How will the housing strategy ensure that the overall housing target is delivered, particularly in view of recent economic conditions and the likely future housing renewal programme, and how will it help to deliver the relevant elements of the Pennine Lancashire Housing Strategy?

---

11 Ministerial statement by Greg Clark, Minister of State for Decentralisation [23 March 2011]
e. What is the current 5, 10 & 15-year housing land supply position, in terms of existing commitments, proposed new sites and provision identified in the latest SHLAA and other relevant evidence? What is the make-up of proposed housing provision in terms of existing and proposed sites, the contribution from windfall developments, and allowances for demolitions?

f. Is the information in the SHLAA & SHMA soundly based, accurate and up-to-date, have they been prepared in line with national guidance, and have they taken account of the current housing market, housing renewal programmes and economic conditions?

5.2 Housing mix (Policy H1)

a. Is there sufficient justification and evidence to support the mix of housing sought in Policy H1, consistent with the Strategic Housing Market/Housing Needs Assessment?

b. Is the balance between brownfield and greenfield land appropriate and soundly based, and does the strategy give enough emphasis to the regeneration of the urban areas?

c. Will the delivery of new housing be affected by recent Ministerial statements about housing targets, housing density and development of residential gardens?

d. What is the status and justification for the statement (para 4.34) resisting the development of land within the garden/curtilage of residential properties, particularly in the context of the latest national guidance in PPS3, and should this be incorporated into Policy H1?

5.3 Affordable Housing (Policy H2)

a. Does the policy and accompanying text provide sufficient guidance about the provision of affordable housing, in line with national policy (PPS3; ¶ 29), particularly in terms of:
   i. the overall target for the amount of affordable housing to be provided (including separate targets for social-rented and intermediate affordable housing), and the size and type of affordable housing;
   ii. the range of circumstances in which affordable housing will be required (including indicative site size thresholds and proportion of affordable housing);
   iii. the approach to seeking developer contributions to facilitate the provision of affordable housing?

b. Is the need for affordable housing supported by evidence, including an up-to-date Housing Needs Survey/Strategic Housing Market Assessment; are the affordable housing target, threshold and proportion fully justified, supported by an informed assessment of their economic viability and consistent with those of adjoining districts; and how will sufficient affordable housing be delivered?

5.4 Gypsies & Travellers (Policy H3)

a. Does Policy H3 make adequate provision for gypsy and traveller accommodation, having regard to the latest Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment, the conclusions of the EIP Panel examining the regional review, and current national policy?

b. Are there any implications arising from the announcement that the Government intends to revoke Circulars 01/2006 & 04/2007, along with the recently published consultation draft guidance on Planning for Traveller Sites?

---

12 Ministerial statement by Greg Clark MP on Previously Developed Land and Density [9 June 2010; DCLG]

13 Ministerial statement by Rt Hon Eric Pickles (Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government) [dated 29 August 2010]

14 Planning for Traveller Sites - Consultation [April 2011; DCLG]
6. OTHER THEMATIC POLICIES

Key issue:
Does the Core Strategy provide an appropriate, effective and soundly based framework for the provision of a range of public facilities and services, high quality design, green infrastructure, protection of the natural and built environment, biodiversity and environmental amenity, sustainable development and climate change, and improved accessibility, which is fully justified and consistent with national policy?

A. EDUCATION

a. New and improved education (Policy ED1)
   i. How will Policy ED1 help to provide accessible, high quality educational facilities and improve basic/higher level skills and qualifications?

B. HEALTH

a. Green Space and facilities for walking/cycling (Policy HC1)
   i. Is the approach to providing additional green space from major housing development appropriate, soundly based and justified with evidence, including consideration of economic viability issues?

b. Leisure and health (Policy HC2)
   i. Does Policy HC2 encompass all relevant types of leisure, health and cultural facilities, and how will the policy be implemented?

c. Design of Residential Roads (Policy HC3)
   i. Is Policy HC3 in accordance with national guidance in PPG13 and the latest edition of the Manual for Streets?

d. Community Benefits/Planning Obligations (Policy HC4)
   i. Does Policy HC4 accord with national guidance on Planning Obligations (Circular 05/2005) and emerging legislation/regulations/guidance on the Community Infrastructure Levy?

C. ENVIRONMENT

a. Green Infrastructure (Policy Env1)
   i. How will the policy effectively deliver the Green Infrastructure Network?

b. Natural Environment Enhancement & Landscape Character (Policies Env2-Env3)
   i. How will Policy Env2 effectively secure the enhancement of the natural environment, including conservation and enhancement of the wider environment and the protection and promotion of biodiversity?
   ii. Does Policy Env3 and the accompanying text address all relevant landscape types?

c. Sustainable Development, Climate Change and Renewable Energy (Policies Env4-Env5)
   i. How will Policy Env4 direct development to the most sustainable locations and effectively address issues related to climate change?
   ii. Should the Core Strategy make further references to minerals and waste policies in Lancashire County Council’s Minerals & Waste Development Framework, including mineral resources and mineral safeguarding?
   iii. How will Policy Env5 effectively assist in achieving national and regional/sub-regional renewable energy targets, and should the text reflect the findings of the Lancashire Renewal Energy Capacity Study 2011?

d. High Quality Design and Environmental Amenity (Policies Env6-Env7)
   i. How will Policy Env6 help to conserve and enhance the character and quality of Hyndburn’s urban and rural environments and ensure that developments of high quality design are delivered?
   ii. Does Policy Env7 cover all the relevant potential adverse environmental impacts, and how will it be implemented?
D. ACCESSIBILITY
   a. Improving Connectivity (Policy T1)
      i. Does Policy T1 give sufficient emphasis to guiding development to sustainable and accessible locations?
   b. Cycle and Footpath Networks (Policy T2)
      i. How will existing/proposed cycle and pedestrian networks be identified, safeguarded and extended?
   c. Motorway and Trunk Road Improvements (Policy T3)
      i. Has the Core Strategy assessed the individual and cumulative impact of the overall scale and pattern of proposed development on the strategic highway network, particularly given the current capacity constraint/congestion of the M65/A56, and how will the impact of particular developments be assessed?
      ii. What improvements are likely to be required to the strategic road network as a result of proposed developments in the Core Strategy?
      iii. Does the Highways Agency have any outstanding concerns about the impact of the scale and location of proposed development envisaged by the Core Strategy on the strategic road network?

7. AREA BASED POLICIES

A. ACCRINGTON AND TOWNSHIPS
   a. Amount & Distribution of Housing in Accrington (Policy A1)
      i. Is the amount and proportion of new housing development to be developed within Accrington and its townships appropriate, soundly based, deliverable and justified with evidence (including the SHLAA & East Accrington SPD)?
   b. Accrington Town Centre (Policy A2)
      i. Is the policy for Accrington town centre, including its role and status in the hierarchy and the focus for new retail and office development, appropriate, soundly based, deliverable and justified with evidence?
   c. Local Centres in Accrington (Policy A3)
      i. Is the role and status of local centres in Accrington appropriate, soundly based and justified with evidence?
   d. Brookside Business Centre (Policy A5)
      i. What are the exceptional circumstances justifying removal of land from the Green Belt and the impact on the purposes of the Green Belt?
      ii. Are there any serious constraints which may adversely affect the delivery of this proposal, such as the implications of the former Chemical Works, HSC & COMAH Orders/Hazardous Substance Consent and land contamination issues?
   e. Huncoat (Policies A7-A9)
      i. What is the basis and justification for the major housing proposal at Huncoat, and what is the likely scale and timescale of development?
      ii. What are the implications of redeveloping the former colliery site for housing in terms of practicality and deliverability, and are there any adverse implications related to the presence of the nearby RSPCA animal centre and proposed employment/waste management development?
      iii. What is the basis and justification for the strategic employment site at Huncoat, and is this consistent with the Pennine Lancashire MAA/Spatial Strategy, including meeting the employment needs of Hyndburn?
      iv. Are the proposals for Huncoat in the Core Strategy consistent with the latest proposals for waste management facilities and a link road in the Lancashire Minerals & Waste Site Allocations DPD?
      v. What are the implications of the latest position on the Waste Technology Park and Whinney Hill Link Road, and will these have any implications for the deliverability of the proposal, particularly in terms of access, viability, funding and possible land contamination?
      vi. What are the exceptional circumstances justifying the removal of land from the Green Belt and its impact on the purposes of the Green Belt?
      vii. What is the state of play on the feasibility study and the progress on finalising plans for Huncoat, and will further amendments be needed to the policies and text in the Core Strategy?
B. GREAT HARWOOD
   a. Housing in Great Harwood (Policy GH1)
      i. Is the amount and proportion of new housing development to be developed within Great Harwood appropriate, soundly based, deliverable and justified with evidence (including the SHLAA)?
   b. Great Harwood Town Centre (Policy GH2)
      i. Is the role and status of Great Harwood as a historic market town providing key local services and specialist/leisure shopping facilities appropriate, soundly based and justified with evidence?
   c. Core Strategy policies
      i. Are there any specific reasons why the policies in the Core Strategy should not be relevant, applicable and appropriate for Great Harwood?

C. RISHTON
   a. Housing in Rishton (Policy R1)
      i. Is the amount and proportion of new housing development to be developed within Rishton appropriate, soundly based, deliverable and justified with evidence (including the SHLAA)?
   b. Rishton Local Centre (Policy R2)
      i. Is the role and status of Rishton as a local centre providing key services to the local community appropriate, soundly based and justified with evidence?

D. KNUZDEN & WHITEBIRK
   a. Strategic Employment Site at Whitebirk (Policy KW1)
      i. What is the basis and justification for the Strategic Employment Site at Whitebirk (Lantern Park), and is this consistent with the Pennine Lancashire MAA & Spatial Strategy and the Blackburn with Darwen Core Strategy, including its contribution to meeting the employment needs of Hyndburn and the sub-regional employment strategy?
      ii. What is the current position on developing this site, including the latest position on the Section 106 agreement, and is the development deliverable within the plan period, in view of the constraints to development, traffic/highways implications, infrastructure and funding issues?
      iii. Does the Core Strategy properly reflect the need for cross-boundary working in relation to the Whitebirk Strategic Employment Site?
      iv. What is the basis, position and justification for the possible future extension of the Whitebirk employment site (Whitebirk 2), and the means by which it might be delivered (including Green Belt implications), and is the approach consistent with the Pennine Lancashire MAA and Blackburn with Darwen Core Strategy?
      v. What is the latest position on the sub-regional review of strategic employment land supply and future requirements in Pennine Lancashire related to the Whitebirk 2 employment site?

E. RURAL AREAS
   a. Amount and Distribution of Housing in Rural Areas (Policy RA1)
      i. Is the policy seeking to limit new housing development to local needs in rural settlements appropriate, soundly based, deliverable and justified with evidence (including the SHLAA)?
   b. Altham Business Park (Policy RA3)
      i. What are the exceptional circumstances justifying the removal of land from the Green Belt and the impact on the purposes of the Green Belt?
      ii. Are there other options available for existing occupiers to meet their business needs?
8. OTHER MATTERS

8.1 Monitoring and implementation
   a. Are the arrangements for monitoring the policies of the Core Strategy adequate, effective and soundly based, including the indicators, baseline information and targets/milestones used?
   b. Are the delivery mechanisms, phasing and timescales for the implementation of the policies clearly identified, and does the Core Strategy and supporting evidence clearly identify the key elements of infrastructure which are crucial for the delivery of the strategy, including key delivery partners, funding and implementation arrangements?
   c. What provision has been made in the Core Strategy and associated documents for alternative strategies to be implemented, and do the policies include sufficient flexibility and contingencies to take account of unexpected changes in circumstances?
   d. Does the Core Strategy specifically indicate the circumstances when it will need to be reviewed, and identify the remedial actions to be taken if policies are not being successfully implemented?

8.2 Other issues
   a. Other matters not yet specified
B. **ACCRINGTON AREA ACTION PLAN**

1. **LEGAL & PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

Key issues:

1.1 Has the Accrington AAP been prepared in accordance with the current Local Development Scheme (LDS), including its timetable, content and timescale, and in compliance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)?

1.2 Has the Accrington AAP been subject to Sustainability Appraisal, including a final report on the published plan; and is it clear how the Sustainability Appraisal influenced the final plan and dealt with mitigation measures? Has Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Directive been carried out to the satisfaction of Natural England?

1.3 Does the Accrington AAP have regard to national planning policy, and is there sufficient local justification for any policies that add nothing to, or are not consistent with, national planning policy?

1.4 Does the Accrington AAP conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy, is it consistent with the Hyndburn Core Strategy, and does it reflect the various Pennine Lancashire MAA/strategies and other relevant programmes, strategies and initiatives?

1.5 Does the Accrington AAP have regard to the Hyndburn Sustainable Community Strategy?

2. **VISION AND OBJECTIVES**

Key issues:

2.1 Does the Vision:

a. clearly set out the vision for the future strategy and spatial pattern of development in Accrington over the plan period?

b. contain sufficient local and spatial distinctiveness, reflecting key elements and local issues relevant to Accrington, including the vision, priorities and policies of the Core Strategy?

2.2 Objectives:

a. Does the Accrington AAP contain clear, specific and locally distinctive objectives, which reflect the full range of key issues and objectives relevant to the implementation of the plan?

b. Should the plan give more emphasis to promoting sustainable forms of transport, including stronger pedestrian routes and cycling?

3. **POLICIES**

Key issues:

3.1 Policy ATC1 - Is the range of uses within the town centre appropriate, soundly based, justified with evidence, and consistent with the Core Strategy and national policy guidance (including PPS4)?

3.2 Policy ATC2 - Is the policy to limit non-retail uses within the Primary frontages and restriction of Class A5 uses appropriate, soundly based, justified with evidence and consistent with the Core Strategy and national policy in PPS4?

3.3 Should Policy ATC2 confirm that new comparison and convenience retailing will be focused in the Primary Retail Area of the town centre?

3.4 Is the strategy for the redevelopment and growth of the Arndale Centre soundly based, and should the Primary Retail Area be extended around the Arndale Shopping Centre (Whalley Road/Eastgate) to enable this strategy to be implemented?

3.5 Should Policy ATC7 indicate the scale of housing development proposed in Accrington town centre, including affordable housing?

3.6 Policies ATC19-ATC20: Has the Accrington AAP assessed the impact of development proposals on cycle and car parking in and around the town centre?

---

15 Most of these issues should be covered in the Council’s Legal Compliance Self-Assessment [AAAP_Sub1.5]
3.7 Is the approach to assessing the transport impact of new developments, including transport assessments and travel plans, appropriate and soundly based, and is there sufficient evidence that adequate transport analysis has been undertaken to assess the traffic/transport impact of proposed developments?

3.8 How will Policies ATC22/ATC24 ensure that the necessary infrastructure and additional requirements for facilities (e.g., education, community, health care and waste management) is provided to enable the strategy to be delivered?

3.9 Is the approach to flood risk management and drainage soundly based and consistent with national policy guidance (including PPS25), and are there any issues outstanding from the Environment Agency?

3.10 Does the plan make sufficient reference to coal mining legacy issues, including ground instability?

4. **SPATIAL QUARTERS**

   **Key issues:**

4.1 Do the policies and proposals for the Spatial Quarters clearly identify the distribution of land-uses and their inter-relationships, including specific site allocations, and set out the timetable for the implementation of the proposals?

4.2 Is the approach to proposing development in flood zone areas and over culverts appropriate, soundly based, justified with evidence and consistent with national policy in PPS25, and are there any issues outstanding from the Environment Agency?

4.3 Are the specific proposals deliverable, in view of flood risk, drainage, land contamination, economic and other constraints and issues?

5. **OTHER MATTERS**

5.1 **Monitoring and implementation**

   a. Are the arrangements for monitoring the policies and proposals of the Accrington AAP adequate, effective and soundly based, including the indicators, baseline information and targets/ milestones used?

   b. Are the delivery mechanisms and timescales for the implementation of the policies clearly identified, including details of who will implement each proposal?

   c. Does the Accrington AAP provide sufficient flexibility to implement the proposed strategy if the policies are not being successfully implemented?

5.2 **Proposals Map**

   a. Does the Proposals Map accurately illustrate the key proposals of the Accrington AAP?

   b. What is the status of The Masterplan [AAAP_Sub1.2]?

5.3 **Other matters**

   a. Other matters not yet specified.
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