

BLACKPOOL LOCAL PLAN

PART 1: CORE STRATEGY

BLACKPOOL COUNCIL STATEMENT

MATTER 8

SOUTH BLACKPOOL GROWTH AND ENHANCEMENT

APRIL 2015

Blackpool Council

A decorative graphic consisting of two parallel, wavy lines in a light blue-grey color, positioned below the council name.

CONTENTS

Matter 8		Page
8.1	Do the Core Strategy proposals in respect of South Blackpool Growth and Enhancement appropriately align with, but not prejudge, those emerging in Fylde and Wyre boroughs? (see also Matter 1)	3
8.2	Is the safeguarding through policies CS3/CS24 of the NS&I site at Mythop Road as a location for employment use soundly based? Is there evidence of likely demand for the site for employment use during the plan period? Would the site be more appropriately designated for a mix of residential (policy CS25) and employment use? (see also Matter 3)	3
8.3	Should policy CS25 (2) refer to the impact on surface and wastewater networks being “most appropriately managed”. Is MM031 necessary to the soundness of the plan?	3
8.4	Should policy CS6 (or policy CS25 or the Core Strategy more generally) set out additional detailed requirements in respect of development at South Blackpool and the protection of Natura 2000 sites from recreational pressure? (see also Matter 1 and Matter 5)	4
8.5	Is policy CS26 inappropriately restrictive, bearing in mind the time likely to be necessary to get a Neighbourhood Plan in place? Does it accord with paragraph 55 of the NPPF? Should it permit additional new development on disused land with a highway frontage? Is MM032 necessary to the soundness of the plan?	4

Matter 8 – South Blackpool Growth and Enhancement (Policies CS1, CS24, CS25, CS26, CS27)

Participants: Blackpool BC, NS&I/Rowland Homes

Introduction

This Statement has been produced by Blackpool Council to outline its response to the Matters and Questions raised by the Inspector for the Hearings into the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy Development Plan Document (SD001).

The Statements form the main basis for the Council's submission to the Hearings. Where appropriate the Statements draw upon and cross reference to the main sources of information used in the preparation of the Core Strategy. To assist document numbers are referenced where appropriate.

Position of the Council regarding Matter 8

8.1 Do the Core Strategy proposals in respect of South Blackpool Growth and Enhancement appropriately align with, but not prejudice, those emerging in Fylde and Wyre boroughs? (see also Matter 1)

8.1.1 Please see response to Matter 1, Question 1.1(d)

8.2 Is the safeguarding through policies CS3/CS24 of the NS&I site at Mythop Road as a location for employment use soundly based? Is there evidence of likely demand for the site for employment use during the plan period? Would the site be more appropriately designated for a mix of residential (policy CS25) and employment use? (see also Matter 3)

8.2.1 Please see response to Matter 3, Question 3.6.

8.3 Should policy CS25 (2) refer to the impact on surface and waste water networks being "most appropriately managed". Is MM031 necessary to the soundness of the plan?

8.3.1 MMO31 amended CS25 (2) as a response to a representation from United Utilities.

8.3.2 United Utilities have provided some further clarification with regards to their suggested modification. In light of the existing infrastructure provision in the area and the size of the proposed development, they acknowledge that development is

likely to have an impact on the existing surface water and waste water network within Blackpool. However the exact 'level of impact' cannot be understood at this stage as it is too early in the planning process to fully assess the drainage strategies for specific developments. Therefore the suggested amendment to the text within Policy CS25 gives the flexibility for sustainable solutions to be considered and agreed at the appropriate time, when United Utilities are able to assess the level of impact against its acceptability – thereby 'most appropriately managing' the impact.

8.3.3 The minor modification therefore provides additional flexibility and ensures the policy is realistic and deliverable.

8.4 Should policy CS6 (or policy CS25 or the Core Strategy more generally) set out additional detailed requirements in respect of development at South Blackpool and the protection of Natura 2000 sites from recreational pressure? (see also Matter 1 and Matter 5)

8.4.1 Please see response to Matter 5, Question 5.5.

8.5 Is policy CS26 inappropriately restrictive, bearing in mind the time likely to be necessary to get a Neighbourhood Plan in place? Does it accord with paragraph 55 of the NPPF? Should it permit additional new development on disused land with a highway frontage? Is MM032 necessary to the soundness of the plan?

8.5.1 Minor modification MM032 enables the wording of policy CS26 to more appropriately reflect paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and responds to the representation received from CW Planning. With the addition of this minor modification the policy is not considered inappropriately restrictive and now aligns with the NPPF in terms of the exceptions set out in paragraph 55.

8.5.2 There has been a longstanding range of diverse views on the future of the Moss. Previous Core Strategy consultations have highlighted the recognition by residents in the area of some need for change but that this change should reflect and embrace as far as possible the open and semi-rural distinctive character and appearance of the Moss. Responding to this, a neighbourhood planning approach is being promoted in this area to enable the local community to develop a shared vision and to shape and direct development which recognises and appropriately responds to this distinctive character.

8.5.3 The Council will work with the Marton Moss community through the neighbourhood planning approach to determine in what circumstances housing development is appropriate on the Moss. This could include new infill development on disused land with a highway frontage. The Council considers it premature for it to include permissive policy on this type of development at this stage without consulting the

community. Notwithstanding the uncertainty of the meaning of the term 'disused sites', it is not considered that a blanket allowance of infill development on highway frontages on disused sites would be a sustainable approach to apply to the whole of the Moss area. It would also undermine the neighbourhood planning approach that is the emphasis of Policy CS26.