

Blackpool Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADMP)

Inspector: Luke Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

Programme Officer: Tony Blackburn

EXAMINATION HEARINGS DAY 2 (AM & PM)

MATTERS 3 & 4

All hearing sessions will take place digitally using MS Teams. This Agenda should be read alongside the Matters, Issues and Questions and responses to them and the Inspector Guidance Notes. The discussion on each agenda item will also consider the main modifications proposed by the Council in EL1.002b where necessary.

The AM Session will deal with all Issues associated with Matter 3 as well as Issue X of Matter 4 which relates to the Blackpool Airport Enterprise Zone (BAEZ). The remaining Issues associated with Matter 4 will be considered at the PM session.

10:00am Tuesday 6 December 2021 (AM Session)

AGENDA

MATTER 3 - Is the SADMP's approach to the Green Belt (GB) justified and consistent with national policy?

Issue (vii): Do exceptional circumstances exist sufficient to justify the alteration of the GB's boundaries?

1. Does the Core Strategy (CS) establish a need for changes to the Green Belt Boundary? Which Policies and How?
 - a. Policy CS6 Green Infrastructure?
 - b. Policy CS1 Strategic Location of Development?
 - c. Policy CS3 Economic Development and Employment?
 - d. Policy CS24 South Blackpool Employment Growth?
2. Would the need for development identified in the CS be met without a review of the Green Belt boundary?

3. How has the designation of the BAEZ and the associated master planning exercise influenced the need to review the Green Belt boundary?
4. Is the designation of the BAEZ and its delivery within the Plan Period sufficient to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in principle?
 - a. What specific need does the BAEZ establish up to 2027? Is the additional employment land allocated in the Green Belt needed by 2027?
 - b. How has the 14 hectares of employment land provided in Fylde been factored into the consideration of the need for additional employment land?
 - c. What would be the consequences if the SADMP did not release land from the Green Belt for additional housing and employment land at the BAEZ?
 - d. Paragraphs 138 and 143 (f) of the NPPF (Green belt purposes and define boundaries clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent)?
5. Is the Council's case for releasing HSA1.13 from the Green Belt solely to enable the BAEZ? Is there a need for the additional housing?
6. How would any revenue generated from the development of HSA1.13 be tied into enabling the BAEZ?
 - a. What exactly would the HSA1.13 enable?
 - b. What would be the consequences if there was no enabling housing development?
7. Overall, is the Council's approach to identifying a need to review the Green Belt and demonstrating exceptional circumstances consistent with national policy?
 - a. South Ribble Local Plan Inspectors Report 2015, NPPF 2012?

Matter 4 - Are the sites allocated for housing and employment justified and deliverable?

Issue (x): Is the SADMP's approach to the provision of employment justified and deliverable?

1. Is Policy DM8 effective in all other aspects?

- a. Is it explicitly clear in that it seeks to allocate new employment land for development?
- b. Is a design framework required for all development in the BAEZ? Should a design framework also consider biodiversity net gain?
- c. Should Policy DM8 explicitly refer to Green Belt compensatory improvements?
- d. Should National Highways role in assessing the impact of new development on the Strategic Road Network be recognised?

Issue (viii): Is the Council's approach to safeguarded land and compensatory improvements to the Green Belt justified and consistent with national policy?

1. Is the approach to safeguarded land in Policy SLA1 justified and consistent with national policy? Why is it necessary to identify an area of safeguarded land in order to meet longer-term development needs? Would the land identified in Policy SLA1 meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period? What specific development needs would it meet?
2. Does the SADMP make the status of the safeguarded land it identifies clear, in accordance with paragraph 143(d) of the NPPF?
3. Does the SADMP adequately set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt (including safeguarded land) can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of the remaining Green Belt land, and how such improvements could be secured?

14:00am Tuesday 7 December 2021 (PM Session)

Matter 4 continued - Are the sites allocated for housing and employment justified and deliverable?

AGENDA

Issue (ix): Is the SADMP's approach to the provision of housing justified and deliverable?

1. Was the methodology used to assess and select the proposed site allocations appropriate? Were reasonable alternatives considered and tested? Are the reasons for selecting the preferred sites and rejecting others clear?
2. To what extent would housing sites anticipated to come forward in the next five years be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years?
3. For sites scheduled later in the plan period, are these in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged?
4. Is the loss of public open space associated with HSA1.2 justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 99 of the NPPF? Should mitigation measures be more clearly specified?
5. Why are Sites HSA1.3 and HSA1.4 not detailed as a single allocation?
6. Why are the two separate land parcels associated with HSA1.5 not detailed as separate allocations? Is the loss of public open space associated with HSA1.5 justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 99 of the NPPF? Should mitigation measures be more clearly specified?
7. Should site HSA1.7 more clearly specify heritage mitigation measures? MM35?
8. Are there no heritage assets on site HSA1.7? Why is the recording of the wall etc. necessary?
9. Site HSA1.9 - are the details accurate - cleared brownfield site or in use as a car park? Views of the Blackpool Tower?

10. Is the loss of public open space associated with site HSA1.13 justified? Should mitigation measures be more clearly specified? Are exceptional circumstances fully evidenced to justify altering the Green Belt boundaries as proposed? Should Green Belt compensatory improvements be identified?

END