

Matter 6: Accessibility and Transport		
Issue 6: Has the Plan been positively prepared and is it justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of its policies and proposals for transport and infrastructure?		
General	<p>1. Paragraph 110 of the Framework states that it should be ensured that in assessing sites to be allocated for development in plans, any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion) or on highway safety can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. What evidence is there to demonstrate that this is the case for the growth proposed in the Hyndburn Local Plan?</p>	<p>The council considers that the Local Plan has adequately demonstrated that effects to highway safety and capacity resulting from the proposed growth can be cost effectively mitigated. The Local Plan is evidenced by the Local Plan Transport Study (HBC7.001a), which provides a robust assessment of the impacts of the proposed growth on the network and is set out in response to Matter 6 Question 2.</p> <p>The council has considered the potential costs of mitigation through the Local Plan Viability Report (HBC2.006), as set out in section 8 of the report as well as through the consideration of other normal development costs, set out in paragraph 12.30. The council recognises that this does not look at site specific assessments but at wider typologies and therefore does not account for site specific costs aside from general allowances set out in section 7 of the report but does follow the guidance set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance. The report, which showing challenging viability across some typologies does not suggest that the proposed growth in the Local Plan is unviable to deliver.</p> <p>The Council have also set out the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (HBC2.011) which sets out required transport infrastructure in section 7. The IDP is a live document and the council will continue to update this as further information develops.</p> <p>The council acknowledge that there is further work to identify that the impacts on Junction 8 M65 and Shuttleworth Mead Junction resulting largely from the Huncoat Garden Village development can be cost effectively mitigated. Further information on current work on both these Junctions is set out in Matter 6 Questions 6 and 7 with further evidence on Shuttleworth Mead Junction improvements set out in paper EL3.006b.</p>
	<p>2. Does the Local Plan Transport Study (HBC7.001a) provide a robust assessment of the likely traffic</p>	<p>Yes. The potential impacts of development on both the strategic and local transport networks have been assessed thoroughly through the Local Plan Transport Study</p>

	<p>implications of development proposed in the Plan? Can the impacts on the highway network be acceptably mitigated?</p>	<p>(HBC7.001a) and the council considers that this is consistent with the requirements set out in paragraphs 104 – 106 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The potential impacts have been modelled taking account of demand from both existing sources and planned growth up to 2036 (this excluded Huncoat Garden Village allocation). At the time of undertaking the Local Plan Transport Study, traffic was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and its resulting effects on employment and travel. Traffic data was therefore provided from existing pre-covid sources including previous studies, monitoring sites and transport assessments submitted in support of planning applications, as set out in Section 5 and section 7 of the report.</p> <p>The council acknowledges that the report only accesses impact to 2036, and in line with requirements for a time period of 15 years post adoption from the NPPF the council has extended the Local Plan period to 2040. As outlined in the council’s response to IQ7 of the Inspectors initial questions the council does not believe that this would affect the robustness of the study. This is also borne out in Paragraph paragraph 8.1.2 of the Local Plan Transport Study (HBC7.001a).</p> <p>The council has had no objections from national highways to the methodology or baseline of information used to undertake the assessment, as shown in examination document HBC7.001b and within the statement of Common Ground (H017).</p> <p>The council recognise that the Huncoat Garden Village was not modelled within the Local Plan Transport Study. The Council separately modelled highways impacts of the Huncoat Garden Village in relation to Junction 8 of the M65 and Shuttleworth Mead Junction through the M65 Junction 8 study report (HBC7.006). As detailed in the Statement of Common Ground and responses to Matter 6 Questions 6 and 7 further ongoing work has been undertaken to access these impacts.</p>
	<p>3. A Junction Monitoring Report is proposed to be prepared to assess the implications of traffic growth on J6 and J7 of the M65. What is the anticipated programme for this work? How will any recommendations for highway improvements be funded and delivery ensured?</p>	<p>As set out in both Statements of Common Ground with Blackburn with Darwen (HBC10.002) and National Highways (H017), the council agree to undertake further work to ensure junction monitoring in relation to traffic growth on J6 and J7. The scope of this work is to be agreed within 12 months of the Local Plan being adopted,</p>

		<p>with the programme of delivery to be subsequently agreed between the relevant parties</p> <p>The council would also expect that recommendations and delivery of further highway improvements would trigger a review of the Local Plan. The council would therefore expect that future improvements would be delivered, and funding identified through this review as well as considered in an update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The council would also highlight a strong track record of successful funding bids, as shown through the recent £30 million pound funding from Homes England and £20 million pound levelling up funding received to support redevelopment of Accrington Market Hall, Market Chambers and Burton’s Chambers.</p>
	<p>4. Does the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) reflect the findings of the Local Transport Study? How will the IDP be kept up to date?</p>	<p>The IDP reflects the work undertaken for the Local Plan Transport Study. It will remain live to ensure it is kept up to date throughout the Plan period by the council. Updates to the IDP will be informed by any new or refreshed work, including the Junction Monitoring Reports and outcomes from work relating to both Junction 8 of the M65 and Shuttleworth Mead.</p>
	<p>5. How will the site-specific sustainable transport measures recommended in the Transport Study in Table 7-3 be taken forward and secured?</p>	<p>The council identify that the site-specific sustainable transport measures recommended in the Transport Study are potential options for sites to meet sustainable transport needs. All site allocations would be assessed against the requirements set out in Policy SP23 and SP24 of the proposed Local Plan and Policy DM32 and DM33 of the adopted Development Management Plan.</p> <p>The consideration of the appropriate measures to be taken forward will be a site-by-site basis and will need to consider impacts such as planning viability in the balance. Therefore the council has not adopted to take specific measures forward into the site allocation policies to ensure appropriate flexibility to ensure delivery. The Council considers that any site specific measures identified that can be brought forward would be secured through a S106 at planning application stage.</p>
<p>Junction 8 M65</p>	<p>6. The evidence demonstrates that J8 of the M65 will require improvement to enable the Local Plan growth to</p>	<p>The Council has been working with Lancashire County Council and National Highways on the technical feasibility of mitigating the impact of development at Shuttleworth</p>

	<p>proceed, in particular the Huncoat Garden Village. The Statement of Common Ground with National Highways states that work is ongoing to progress modelling and feasibility appraisal work for the junction. This will feed into an assessment of whether a scheme is deliverable and whether it can be justified for funding to be allocated through the Road Investment Strategy (RIS3) for the scheme. What is the current progress with this work and what are the timescales involved?</p>	<p>Mead. Further details on this are set out in Matter 6 Question 7 and the stage 0 study appended as examination document EL3.006b.</p> <p>Following the completion of this study National Highways are undertaking further modelling and feasibility appraisal work to test the viability of an outline design concept that will have been identified against cost, benefits and design standards. This is expected to ready in late autumn 2025. The information from this study is expected to feed into the funding bid for the RIS3 funding which is now expected to be announced between January and March 2026.</p>
	<p>7. Significant highway improvements will be needed to the A6068/A678 Shuttleworth Mead Crossroads junction due to traffic queuing at this junction affecting vehicles seeking to exit the motorway, resulting in queuing on the motorway slip road. These Improvements will be necessary alongside those at J8. What is the progress with the feasibility work in respect of this junction currently being undertaken by Lancashire County Council?</p>	<p>Lancashire County Council have undertaken a Stage 0 study to assess two options for mitigating the impact of development at Shuttleworth Mead in relation to options for improvements at J8. The study has been appended as document REF EL3.006b.</p> <p>The study has identified that both the low-cost and high-cost options at Shuttleworth Mead are capable of effectively mitigating the traffic implications at J8. The study also acknowledges that the low-cost option potentially could be funded through the Homes England Grant, though this is caveated that this is a high-level cost assessment and further studies would need to be undertaken.</p> <p>The study identifies the further steps that would be required following the stage 0 assessment. This identifies that further studies would be subject to the progress of the Local Plan.</p>
	<p>8. If it is shown that the necessary highway improvements to J8 and or the Shuttleworth Mead Crossroads Junction are not technically feasible to deliver or that funding cannot be secured, what are the implications for the soundness of the Plan?</p>	<p>The council believe that the updated report on Shuttleworth Mead (Ref EL3.006b) and modelling at Junction 8 show that there are technically feasible solutions to ensuring that the necessary highways improvements can be met.</p> <p>The Council accepts that if funding for the necessary highway’s improvements at either Junction 8 or Shuttleworth Mead Junctions cannot be secured then this would impact on the deliverability of the Huncoat Garden Village and therefore the soundness of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The council believe that the information presented in the Lancashire County Council study (REF EL3.006b) shows that there is a potential funding option, through the</p>

		<p>£2.19 million earmarked through the Homes England Grant, for the low-cost scheme to ensure the appropriate upgrades at Shuttleworth Mead Junction.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge that the upgrades at J8 are dependant on the government announcement of RIS3 funding. The Council would advise that Junction 8 has been highlighted as a regional priority, though accepts that this does not guarantee funding through the RIS3 programme.</p> <p>The council recognises that this potentially may not be announced until March 2025 at the latest. The Council recognise that there will need to be a pause to the Local Plan examination to ensure the outcome of the RIS3 funding announcement. The council considers that this would be no longer than six months after the examination hearings and therefore would be compliant with the timescales set out in Matthew Pennycook’s letter to the Planning Inspectorate (dated 30 July 2024).</p>
	<p>9. Is a phasing strategy for Huncoat Garden Village and other developments planned, e.g. the extension to Altham Business Park EMP3, being investigated?</p>	<p>The Council expects that the Huncoat Garden Village will be a phased approach as set out in the Huncoat Garden Village Masterplan Framework (HBC5.003a), which sets out four phases of development. The Council are currently preparing masterplans for both the Altham and Whitebirk employment allocations, as set out in response to Matter 7 Question 4 (EL3.007). The potential for phasing of these developments will be considered as part of this master planning process.</p>
<p>Policy SP23 Sustainable and Safe transport</p>	<p>10. Is the policy effective, justified and consistent with national planning policy? In particular :</p> <p>a) Part 1c) refers to sufficient off street car parking. Is the policy effective in setting out what the Councils car parking standards are?</p> <p>b) Is it necessary to refer to electric vehicle charging in Part 1c) of the Policy when this is now required by Building Regulations?</p> <p>c) What is the justification for part 1e) of the Policy? Should the policy recognise that other sources of</p>	<p>The Council considers that Policy SP23, when read alongside Policy DM32 of the Development Management Plan, is effective, justified and consistent with national planning policy, specifically addressing the requirements set out in paragraphs 104 and 106 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The reference to sufficient off-street car parking is effective in providing the strategic overarching policy around car parking provision. The car parking standards are set out in the Development Management Plan Policy DM32 part 3 and specifically within Guidance Note 8. Policy DM32 also ensures that parking standards are applied flexibly where specific circumstances are justified.</p>

	<p>funding may be available and in certain circumstances it may be more appropriate for a development to make a proportionate contribution towards highway improvements rather than fund them outright?</p> <p>d) Part 2 of the policy requires a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for schemes that generate a significant amount of movement. Is it clear from the Plan where the threshold lies?</p>	<p>The Council recognises that the building regulations have now set requirements for electric vehicle charging points. The council considers that to avoid duplicate that Part 1c of Policy SP23 should be modified to reflect the new building regulations. The council proposes the following main modification:</p> <p><i>c. incorporate sufficient off-street car-parking and encourage greater use of public transport, cycling and walking. Where off-street parking is provided, facilities to enable electric vehicle charging should be made available</i></p> <p>The council considers that part 2 of the policy is supported by the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), specifically in paragraph 113 which states that all developments that will generate significant amount of traffic movement should be required to be supported by a transport statement or assessment. The council recognise that there is no current national guidance on when a transport assessment or statement is required. The council consider that policy DM32 part 2 and the subsequent guidance note 8 adequately reflects the indicative thresholds for determining whether a transport assessment or statement is required alongside a planning application.</p>
<p>Community Infrastructure</p>		
<p>Policy SP8 Open Space Provision</p>	<p>1. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?</p>	<p>The policy is supported by the principles outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), specifically addressing the need for accessible open spaces that support the health, social, and cultural well-being of communities. The NPPF highlights the importance of planning for safe, inclusive, and accessible green infrastructure (para 96) and encourages planning policies to promote the provision of shared spaces, community facilities, and open spaces to enhance the sustainability of communities (para 97). Policy SP8 draws on this national guidance, ensuring that new residential developments provide green infrastructure that contributes to broader health and well-being objectives.</p>

		<p>Policy SP8 is clear in its approach to promoting multi-functional green infrastructure, which aligns with NPPF objectives of supporting sustainable development and climate resilience. By encouraging green spaces that provide multiple benefits — from biodiversity to flood mitigation — the policy sets a practical framework for delivering high-quality, sustainable open spaces that can be effectively integrated into residential areas. The requirement for sustainable management schemes (Part 2 of Policy SP8) ensures that open spaces remain well-maintained, accessible, and safe over time, promoting their long-term functionality and use for recreation, social interaction, and health benefits.</p> <p>The policy aligns closely with key NPPF principles, including the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure. Paragraph 96 of the NPPF emphasizes the need for open spaces that enable healthy lifestyles, while paragraph 102 links access to open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity directly to the health and well-being of communities. Policy SP8 is consistent with these goals by ensuring that development includes accessible, high-quality green infrastructure that contributes to both community well-being and environmental sustainability. Additionally, the policy's commitment to protecting existing open spaces and enhancing them through development aligns with NPPF Paragraph 103, which stresses the importance of safeguarding open spaces from unnecessary development.</p>
	<p>2. Bearing in mind the longevity of the policy, and the fact that the Framework has been and will be revised in the future, is reference to a particular paragraph of the Framework appropriate in the policy?</p>	<p>Given that future revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are likely, references to a particular paragraph of the Framework may become outdated within the plan period. This could create a challenge for ensuring the longevity and relevance of the policy. The Council Propose the following main modification:</p> <p><i>“b) protect and enhance existing open space provision in accordance with Paragraph 99 of the NPPF and with criteria set out in Policy DM21.”</i></p>
	<p>3. Part b) of the policy references Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD. Is part 1f) of Policy DM21 consistent with the Framework and Policy SP8 in</p>	<p>Part 1f) of Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD states:</p> <p>“The loss of land designated as open space will only be permitted where:...</p>

	<p>particular. Should SP8 be modified to make the expectations of the policy clear?</p>	<p>...f. a replacement facility of the same type is provided by the developer directly on a site which is equivalent or better in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility or an agreed contribution is made to the Council for new provision or the improvement of existing open space and maintenance.”</p> <p>This part of the policy is consistent with national policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 99(b) of the NPPF states that open space should not be built on unless "the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location." The wording of DM21.1f reflects this test closely and remains aligned with national policy, despite the Development Management DPD having been adopted under the 2012 version of the Framework. As the relevant national policy on open space has remained largely unchanged through successive versions of the NPPF, the approach in DM21.1f is still considered consistent.</p> <p>In terms of consistency with Policy SP8 of the Plan, Policy SP8 sets the strategic objective of protecting and enhancing existing open spaces and securing new provision where necessary. While Policy SP8 establishes the overall direction, it does not contain detailed criteria for managing the loss of open space or the expectations for mitigation. In this respect, DM21.1f provides important implementation detail that gives practical effect to Policy SP8. The policies are therefore consistent and operate together as part of a coherent policy framework.</p>
	<p>4. Are all the open space designations shown on the Policies Map appropriate and justified?</p>	<p>The open space designations shown on the Policies Map are considered both appropriate and justified.</p> <p>The designations are directly informed by HBC4.001 Open Space Audit Report (2022) which provides a comprehensive and up-to-date assessment of open space provision across the Borough. The audit involved a detailed review of all open spaces within the Council’s database, supplemented by site visits to ensure an accurate understanding of each site’s current use and condition.</p> <p>During the audit, sites that no longer served as open space or had been developed, as well as those below the size threshold of 0.2 hectares, were excluded from the</p>

		<p>assessment. This ensures that the open space designations on the Policies Map reflect only those areas that are currently functional as open space and meet the minimum size criteria.</p> <p>The Council is confident that the open space designations on the Policies Map accurately represent the current situation on the ground. The audit’s findings have been incorporated into the designations, ensuring that all identified spaces are properly recognised and protected in line with local and national policy objectives.</p> <p>The designations are consistent with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which emphasizes the importance of accessible, high-quality green spaces for community health, social, and environmental benefits.</p>
<p>Policy SP9 Provision of Community Facilities</p>	<p>5. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with the Framework? Should reference be made to the possible loss of the facility through change of use not just redevelopment in part 2 of the policy in the interest of effectiveness?</p>	<p>The Council considers Policy SP9 to be justified, effective and consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. When considered against paragraph 93 of the NPPF (September 2023), it is considered that the Policy SP9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) is positively drafted for the provision of new and improved community facilities. Combined with Hyndburn DMDPD Policy DM7, it also provides a criteria-based approach to enhance the sustainability of communities. b) has through the Policy and its supporting text has considered and supported the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community (footnote 52: for the purpose of Policy SP9, community facilities include those which provide for the health, social, educational, spiritual, recreational and cultural needs of the community. It does not include local shops or public houses which are covered by other policies in the DM DPD). c) Combined with DM DPD Policy DM7, protected the existing community facilities from any unjustified losses. d) Combined with DM DPD Policy DM7 has taken a positive approach towards new or improved community facilities to enable their modernisation and retention for the benefit of the community.

		<p>The Council acknowledges that reference to the change of use should be added to part 2 of this policy. The Council proposes the following main modification to Part 2 of Policy SP9:</p> <p><i>2) The Council will support proposals for new or improved sports, recreation, health, community and cultural facilities, seeking to protect and enhance a range of facilities to support the social well-being of the Borough's residents. Where the loss of a facility is threatened through redevelopment and <u>change of use</u>, the criteria set out in Policy DM7 will be used to assess development proposals. In the case of loss of sport or recreational facilities, including playing fields, paragraph 99 of NPPF will be applicable.</i></p>
	<p>6. Policy SP9 includes reference to sport and recreational facilities as well as playing pitches. Is this appropriate and effective? Does the Policy give sufficient protection to these uses in line with paragraph 99 of the Framework? Would playing fields and sport and recreation facilities be more appropriately considered under Policy SP8?</p>	<p>The Council considers that Policy SP9 is appropriate and effective. The Council believe it is appropriate to consider playing pitches alongside sport and recreational facilities as playing fields contribute to both.</p> <p>The Council accept that playing pitches could be alternatively considered in Policy SP8 however do not see its inclusion in Policy SP9 as unsound and still provides the appropriate mitigations in line with paragraph 99 of the NPPF. The Policy contained within SP9 specifically refers to the NPPF and therefore is considered to be consistent with the requirements.</p> <p>The Council suggests that further information on playing pitches could be included in the supporting text to Policy SP9 between Paragraphs 5.10 and 5.11:</p> <p><i><u>There is a presumption against the loss of playing fields, sport and recreational facilities. Proposals involving the loss and/or replacement of such facilities should demonstrate that the population benefitting from the original sites or facilities will not be underprovided or subjected to worsening. Only in exceptional circumstances will the Council support proposals where replacement facilities or sites are not delivered in advance of such facilities in undergoing redevelopment.</u></i></p>

<p>SP3 Planning Obligations</p>	<p>1. Is the Policy consistent with the Framework, is it justified, and would it be effective?</p>	<p>Policy SP3 sets out the Council’s approach to securing infrastructure and facilities necessary to support new development, using planning conditions and Section 106 obligations. Part 1 of the policy explicitly refers to the tests for planning obligations as set out in paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that obligations must be:</p> <p>Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, Directly related to the development, and Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 34 of the NPPF requires local plans to set out the contributions expected from development, while paragraphs 54–58 provide guidance on the appropriate use of planning obligations and conditions. By aligning with these provisions, Policy SP3 is consistent with the Framework.</p> <p>The policy is justified in that it reflects national policy and supports the delivery of sustainable development. The inclusion of reference to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) in Part 2 demonstrates that the Council intends to base its obligations on clear and proportionate evidence of infrastructure needs. The IDP provides the necessary justification for identifying when and where contributions will be required.</p> <p>The mention of a potential separate delivery mechanism for the Huncoat Garden Village proposals (Part 3) is also justified, as such large-scale developments often require bespoke approaches to infrastructure delivery and funding.</p> <p>The policy would be effective – it establishes a clear framework for securing developer contributions through mechanisms already widely used in the planning system (i.e., conditions and Section 106 agreements). By referencing national policy tests and the IDP, the policy gives both developers and decision-makers a clear basis for negotiation and implementation.</p>
	<p>2. The Policy states that development proposals should meet the reasonable costs of new infrastructure, facilities</p>	<p>Part 1 of Policy SP3 states that development proposals should meet the reasonable costs of new infrastructure, facilities, or services needed as a direct result of the</p>

	<p>or services needed as a direct result of the development. Is this appropriate in all circumstances for example where a contribution to a major piece of infrastructure may be justified rather than meeting the full costs?</p>	<p>development, in accordance with the tests in paragraph 57 of the NPPF. This ensures that contributions are proportionate, necessary, and directly related to the development in question.</p> <p>In cases where major new infrastructure is required the policy recognises that these are often necessitated by cumulative growth rather than a single development. Part 2 of Policy SP3 makes clear that the Council will identify specific obligations where infrastructure needs are known and evidenced through an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>Importantly, Policy SP3 does not require individual development proposals to fund the full cost of major infrastructure set out in the IDP. Instead, it allows for a proportionate and evidence-based approach to securing contributions from multiple developments. This is consistent with national policy and ensures that delivery of strategic infrastructure remains viable and equitable across sites.</p>
	<p>3. Is the policy and supporting text effective in explaining what form a separate delivery mechanism for Huncoat may take?</p>	<p>Part 3 of Policy SP3 sets out that the Council may consider the introduction of a separate delivery mechanism for the Huncoat Garden Village proposals. Such large-scale developments often require bespoke approaches to infrastructure delivery and funding. Part 3 refers specifically to Policy SP2 which is the strategic policy for the Huncoat Garden Village strategic residential development. Policy SP2 provides further details of the infrastructure requirements required to support the strategic residential development and also signposts to the Huncoat Garden Village Masterplan which contains infrastructure requirements in greater detail.</p> <p>While this cross-referencing provides useful context, neither Policy SP3 nor its supporting text explains what form a separate delivery mechanism might take. Notwithstanding this, it is appropriate that the policy retains flexibility to allow the Council to engage with landowners and adapt the delivery approach as circumstances evolve.</p>
	<p>4. Is the policy sufficiently flexible to take account of individual scheme viability?</p>	<p>Part 1 of the policy states that the Council will seek to secure the reasonable costs of infrastructure, facilities, or services needed as a direct result of development, and that this will be done in line with the tests set out in paragraph 57 of the NPPF. These tests ensure that planning obligations must be necessary, directly related to the</p>

		<p>development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. This wording inherently supports a proportionate and viability-sensitive approach.</p> <p>While Policy SP3 does not explicitly reference viability assessments, national policy and guidance apply to all planning obligations, and the Council is expected to have regard to viability where justified. In practice, where viability concerns are evidenced, contributions can be negotiated or varied to ensure development remains deliverable. This approach is supported by DM DPD Policy GC2.</p> <p>Furthermore, by referring to “reasonable costs” rather than full or fixed contributions, the policy allows room for negotiation based on site-specific circumstances. This provides an appropriate level of flexibility while still securing necessary infrastructure to support sustainable development.</p>
	<p>5. Is the Policy effectively worded to address individual scheme infrastructure requirements which may not be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan?</p>	<p>Policy SP3 is generally effective in establishing the principle that development should contribute to infrastructure needs arising as a direct result of that development. Part 1 states that the Council will seek to secure infrastructure, facilities, or services needed as a direct result of the development, using planning conditions and/or Section 106 obligations, and in line with the tests in paragraph 57 of the NPPF. This wording allows for site-specific infrastructure requirements to be addressed, even if they are not identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>Part 2 of the policy focuses on known and evidenced infrastructure requirements identified in the IDP. However, it does not preclude the Council from requiring infrastructure provision or contributions outside of the IDP where justified by the specific impacts of a proposal. The reference to the NPPF tests in Part 1 provides the necessary flexibility for this.</p>