

Appendix A Possible revision to Policy EM3

EM3 Green Infrastructure;

Plans, strategies, proposals and schemes should aim to deliver wider spatial outcomes that incorporate environmental and socio-economic benefits by:

- Conserving and managing existing green infrastructure;
- Creating new green infrastructure;
- Enhancing its functionality, quality and connectivity.

Local authorities should work with partners to:

- Identify partnerships at an appropriate scale to take forward green infrastructure planning, in the context of relevant environmental and socio-economic objectives;
- Use existing strategies and frameworks to develop consensus on green infrastructure priorities and associated data needs;
- Set out the significant green infrastructure needs across the spectrum of economic, environmental and social objectives;
- Identify and secure opportunities for delivery and put in place implementation plans;
- Integrate proposals to improve green infrastructure in the delivery of new developments, particularly through area based regeneration initiatives and major proposals and schemes;
- Maximize the role of green infrastructure in mitigating and adapting to climate change.

Local Delivery of Green Infrastructure Plans should seek first to make use of existing delivery mechanisms supplemented by bespoke delivery mechanisms where necessary.

Appendix B Inconsistencies

PANEL RESPONSES TO GONW COMMENTS ON INCONSISTENCIES AND NWRA RESPONSES

At various stages during the EiP GONW suggested that there were inconsistencies within the draft RSS, especially in relation to Part 4. The Panel asked them to set these out and they did so in Briefing Paper 9. The Panel asked for NWRA's responses to these comments. We feel that the best way to deal with these very detailed points is to add our own comments and conclusions and this we have done below. Many of the comments have been picked up in our recommendations elsewhere. Others seem to us to be minor details. But we hope what follows will be useful to GONW.

GONW Briefing Paper no 9

Part 4 – Inconsistencies

***NWRA RESPONSE – PLEASE NOTE
THAT THE NWRA VIEWS
EXPRESSED ARE OFFICER LEVEL
OPINIONS FROM THE NWRA.***

PANEL RESPONSES AND COMMENTS

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 There has already been considerable debate at the EIP about the role and purpose of Part 4 of Draft RSS for the North West of England. It will continue when the EIP reconvenes in January and looks in more detail at the policies for each sub-region.
 - 1.2 In advance of this the Panel has asked GONW to set down more specific comment about our concerns with Part 4 and, in particular, to address the issue of inconsistencies.
2. Background
 - 2.1 In our Briefing Paper no 2 we suggested a revised overarching framework to express clearer priorities for growth and regeneration in the North West. This combined elements of RDF policies (the regional spatial framework) with relevant aspects of Part 4 (the sub-regional policy frameworks).
 - 2.2 We asked the Panel to consider Part 4's "added value" in the light of our suggested revisions to the overarching framework. We can see a valuable role for sub-regional frameworks to address the challenges and opportunities in each sub-region, tackling strategic policy deficits and adopting a distinctive, place-sensitive approach that recognises the diversity within and between urban and rural areas across the North West.

NWRA welcome the GONW view that the sub-regional frameworks provide a valuable role.

PANEL - WE HAVE DISCUSSED THIS ISSUE IN CHAPTER 3 OF OUR REPORT.

 - 2.3 We are not convinced that Part 4 as currently drafted fully achieves this. Firstly, although there is helpful additional advice in the supporting text, much of the current policy content either simply cross-refers to thematic policy, cites implementation tools, or could equally apply across the region as a whole. Secondly, much of the remaining content in respect of the city regions (less so in the case of Cumbria / N Lancashire) duplicates the regional spatial framework (RDF policies) - especially if the latter were amended as we suggest to draw out the emphasis on the inner areas as well as regional centres, and to articulate regional spatial priorities for growth and regeneration that align more directly with the RES and RFA visions.
 - 2.4 Thirdly, there are numerous inconsistencies between Part 4 policies and the rest of the Plan, and between Part 4 policies themselves. This paper elaborates upon these. In summary they concern:

- the spatial units for which policy is articulated - making it difficult to match the locational priorities in Part 4 with the thematic policies addressing the scale of development (notably housing and employment land);

NWRA – this issue was discussed in earlier debates of the EIP and it was acknowledged by parties (including NWRA) that there is work to be done in matching up geographical distinctions between thematic policies and city regions. The difficulty primarily lies in how data are collected and whether they are publicly available, but not be insurmountable given resources and agreement on boundaries to be used for policies. However, there may be issues and occasions when practical difficulties cannot be overcome.

PANEL – WE HAVE DISCUSSED THIS ISSUE IN OUR REPORT. THE VARIETY OF UNITS UNDOUBTEDLY CAUSES PROBLEMS BUT WE ACCEPT THE NWRA VIEW THAT BECAUSE OF DATA PROBLEMS IN PARTICULAR IT HAS NOT BEEN POSSIBLE TO STANDARDISE THE UNITS AT THIS STAGE. WE RECOMMEND THAT AT THE NEXT REVIEW THE UNITS ARE SO FAR AS POSSIBLE BROUGHT INTO LINE THOUGH WE ALSO NOTE THAT PPS3 WILL LEAD TO THE IDENTIFICATION OF A DIFFERENT SET OF UNITS – HOUSING MARKET AREAS – AND THIS MAY CAUSE FURTHER INCONSISTENCIES TO ARISE.

- regional centres (RDF1) – different priorities on accessibility accorded by thematic transport policy (RT1) and Part 4 (MCR1 and LCR1). Frequently confused with city centres. RDF1 gives no priority to the surrounding inner areas;

NWRA acknowledged the need to include a reference to Inner Areas in Policy RDF1 at earlier sessions of the EIP.

PANEL – OUR PROPOSED APPROACH TO POLICY RDF1 IN CHAPTER 4 OF OUR REPORT ADDRESSES SOME OF THESE ISSUES. WE AGREE THAT THERE ARE DEFINITIONAL PROBLEMS IN RELATION TO CITY CENTRES AND REGIONAL CENTRES – WE ALSO ACCEPT THAT THERE MAY BE DIFFERENT DEFINITIONS FOR DIFFERENT PURPOSES – FOR EXAMPLE THE RETAIL AREA OF A CENTRE MAY BE MORE LIMITED THAN THE AREA WHERE OFFICE, KNOWLEDGE INDUSTRIES, RESIDENTIAL OR MIXED USE MAY BE APPROPRIATE. WE HAVE SOUGHT TO BRING CLARITY TO THE DEFINITIONS ESPECIALLY IN OUR COMMENTS ON MCR1 AND LCR1. HOWEVER WE FEEL THAT ULTIMATELY THE DETAILED DEFINITION OF THESE CENTRES CAN ONLY TAKE PLACE AT

THE LOCAL LEVEL. WE DEAL WITH POLICY RT1 IN CHAPTER 7 OF OUR REPORT.

- regional towns and cities (RDF1) – it is difficult to reconcile the one size fits all approach and concept of “complementarity” with the Part 4 policies, notably in respect of north and south MCR;

NWRA - RDF1 does not set out a one size fits all approach as explained in earlier session of the EIP. The concept of complementarity fits with sub-regional policy by providing the necessary steer between Regional Centres, and regional towns and cities within the City Regions.

PANEL – WE HAVE DEALT WITH THIS IN OUR COMMENTS ON RDF1 AND THE MCR POLICIES.

- key service centres (RDF3) – similarly the blanket concept of local needs does not sit easily with some of the priorities in Part 4, notably Kendal and Penrith;

NWRA – RDF3 does not expound a blanket approach with the subtleties being drawn out in the sub-regional policies in Part 4.

PANEL – WE HAVE DEALT WITH THIS IN OUR RECOMMENDATIONS ON POLICY RDF2 AND TABLE 7.1.

- airports – inconsistent references to their transport gateway and economic development functions. No mention of the role of Manchester Airport as a key driver in W1;

NWRA – no specific policy references given above, but in any case there is a need to set out the transport gateway and economic development functions of airports. Manchester Airport is not featured in W1 as it is not a sector.

PANEL – WE HAVE DEALT WITH THIS IN OUR REPORT. WE DO NOT FEEL IT IS NECESSARY TO MENTION MANCHESTER AIRPORT IN POLICY W1, ANY MORE THAN OTHER PORTS OR AIRPORTS. WE DO NOT SEE IT AS A LOCATION FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (OTHER THAN OPERATIONAL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT).

- lack of transparency – it is difficult to see how Tables 8.1, 9.1, 10.2 deliver the spatial priorities in Part 4 policies and hence difficult to judge whether they are consistent;

NWRA – this issue was discussed in earlier debates of the EIP and it was acknowledged by parties (including NWRA) that there is work to be done in matching up geographical distinctions between thematic policies and city regions. The difficulty primarily lies in how data are collected and whether they are publicly available, but not be insurmountable given resources and agreement on boundaries to be used for policies. However, there may be issues and occasions when practical difficulties cannot be overcome.

PANEL – SEE OUR EARLIER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THESE TABLES. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT WITH THE CHANGES WE PROPOSE THERE IS ANY INCONSISTENCY WITH PART 4. WE HAVE ALREADY COMMENTED ON THE DATA ISSUE.

- within Part 4 – inconsistencies in topic coverage and policy articulation which may result from the scope and approach of the respective sub-regional strategies rather than more substantive policy imperatives.

NWRA – the sub-regional policies are not intended to be an identical set of policy themes and coverage. They follow the two key principles set out in paragraph 1.13 of PPS11 to address functional relationships and strategic policy deficit.

PANEL – WE HAVE SOUGHT TO CLARIFY THE SUB-REGIONAL POLICIES IN OUR RECOMMENDATIONS. WE HAVE STRESSED THE NEED TO LOOK AT THOSE POLICIES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PLAN AS A WHOLE – THEY ARE NOT A STAND ALONE SET OF POLICIES – AS SOME PARTIES APPEARED TO WISH THEM TO BE. WE ACCEPT THAT THE APPROACHES TO THE 5 SUB REGIONS DIFFER SOMEWHAT BUT CONSCIOUSLY ACCEPTED THAT AS BEING REASONABLE GIVEN THAT THE SUB REGIONS ARE IN PRACTICE VERY DIFFERENT AND GIVEN THE WAY IN WHICH THESE SECTIONS WERE CONSTRUCTED (TECHNICAL APPENDIX CHAPTER 2 REFERS).

3. Inconsistencies between Part 4 and the rest of the Plan
 - 3.1 **Sub-areas** – it is difficult to marry up the MCR and LCR sub-area policies (especially for the regional centres and inner areas) with the 'quantitative' thematic policies, such as L4 and W3, which give them concrete expression and provide more detail on the actual scale (and pace, if phased) of development. For example, what is the balance of Manchester, Salford or Trafford's housing allocation in table 9.1 between the various sub-areas? The Monitoring and Implementation Framework

offers no advice on how performance against the sub-area priorities will be judged. At the very least it will require data collection at a finer grain for different geographic units than currently reported on in the RSS Annual Monitoring Report. Note: Northern Manchester in table 9.1 is not the same as the northern part of the Manchester City region.

NWRA - A range of indicators are identified as being suitable for sub regional monitoring in Appendix B of the Implementation Framework. Mechanisms for monitoring the specific sub areas and targets are not yet identified. The intention is that these will be developed as the RSS is finalised. As GONW point out the monitoring will be complex, and may require data on a sub-district basis. Also partnership working will be required and links will need to be made with other sub region / city region monitoring regimes. Given the scale of work needed it would be premature to undertake this in detailed form at this stage, before the sub areas are finalised.

PANEL – WE AGREE THAT THIS IS A COMPLEX AREA. THE INTRODUCTION OF HOUSING MARKET AREAS MAY SIMPLIFY MATTERS THOUGH NOT ALL PARTIES ARE SANGUINE ABOUT THAT – THEIR DEFINITION WILL NOT BE WITHOUT DIFFICULTY AND THEY WILL NO DOUBT GIVE RISE TO FURTHER DATA PROBLEMS. ALL PARTIES APPEAR TO HAVE ACCEPTED THAT THE INTRODUCTION OF HOUSING MARKET AREAS IS FOR THE NEXT ROUND OF RSS AND WE HAVE RECOMMENDED AN EARLY REVIEW IN PRACTICE HOWEVER WE DO NOT AGREE THAT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FIGURES IN TABLE 9.1, THROUGH CORE STRATEGIES AND LDDs WILL BE UNACHIEVABLE GIVEN THE RANGE OF POLICIES THROUGHOUT THE PLAN.

- 3.2 **W1** – we assume these are the same sectors referred to in MCR1 and LCR1 in terms of the CRDPs. W1 bullet two, however, differs from the list in MCR3, and makes no mention of Manchester Airport.

NWRA – The list in W1 attempts to reconcile the sectors identified in the RES and CRDPs (footnote 46 makes that clear) as far as possible. So for example Manchester Airport doesn't appear as a 'sector' in the RES. The airport is identified in the RES under 'key assets and opportunities' as a key international gateway. The rationale for drawing on the RES and CRDPs was the need to ensure alignment with the RES and also awareness of the frequency at which CRDPs seem to be being reviewed

PANEL – WE HAVE MADE VARIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR EXAMPLE TO REMOVE THE LIST FROM MCR3 AND REFER BACK TO POLICY W1 – WHICH ADDRESS THIS POINT. WE HAVE DEALT WITH THE MANCHESTER AIRPORT POINT ABOVE. WE ACCEPT

THAT THE CRDPS ARE IMPORTANT BUT WE DO NOT THINK THEY ARE DETERMINATIVE – THEY MAY CHANGE – SO IF POLICY W1 DOES NOT ACCORD IN DETAIL WITH THEM WE THINK IT IS NOT A PROBLEM. CLEARLY ALIGNMENT WITH THE RES IS IMPORTANT HOWEVER AND WE HAVE CONSIDERED THIS IN OUR REPORT.

- 3.3 **W5** – policy W5 para two suggests that Manchester and Liverpool city centres are the same as the regional centres but policies MCR2 and LCR2 make it clear that this is not the case. Also, although MCR1 and LCR1 refer to the leisure and cultural roles of the regional centres, there are no policies on these aspects elsewhere in the Plan;

NWRA – It is important for Policy W5 to refer to City Centres in line with PPS6, but also have to recognise the identification of Manchester and Liverpool as Regional Centres. There is no specific policy on leisure issues due the lack of a robust evidence base. Identified in para 17.16 as an issue for a future review.

PANEL – WE HAVE ALREADY REFERRED TO THIS POINT – WE AGREE THERE IS A LACK OF CLARITY BUT WE ACCEPT THAT THE W5 DEFINITION MAY BE DIFFERENT FROM THE MCR/LCR DEFINITIONS. THE DETAILED DEFINITION IS FOR THE LOCAL LEVEL. WE HAVE SUGGESTED AN AMENDMENT TO POLICY W5.

- 3.4 **L4** – MCR2 bullet three refers only to impacts on other housing markets. L4 refers to cumulative impacts on four categories of existing stock and markets.

NWRA – L4 provides a more explicit reference whereas MCR2 is overarching incorporating the four categories. However, for clarity, MCR2 could be expanded to set out the four categories. Need to consider any potential redrafting in the light of AGMA's submission for MCR2.

PANEL – WE HAVE SUGGESTED CHANGES TO BOTH MCR2 AND L4.

- 3.5 **RT1** – MCR1 and LCR1 seek to enhance the accessibility of the regional centres. RT1 refers only to enhancing the accessibility of the lower tiers in the settlement hierarchy – the regional towns and cities, and key service centres.

NWRA – Need to consider any potential redrafting in the light of AGMA's and MPU's submissions for MCR1 and LCR1.

PANEL – WE AGREE AND HAVE PROPOSED THAT POLICY RT1 SHOULD BE ALTERED TO COVER REGIONAL CENTRES AS WELL AS REGIONAL TOWNS AND CITIES.

- 3.6 **Airports** – references in MCR1 bullet one and MCR3 to Manchester Airport as a key growth driver are consistent with RT3 but are not reflected in the chapter on “Working in the North West”. The MCR1 bullet seven reference to it as the North of England’s key international gateway is consistent with para 4.2 3) which talks of the airport in transport terms as the key international gateway, but not RT3 which only refers to the role of the airport in economic terms as a key driver.

NWRA – W1 deals with key economic sectors which would preclude Manchester Airport as it is not a sector. The airport functions as a key component of the transport linkages required by the economic sectors identified in W1 which is consistent with the approach set out in MCR1, MCR3 and RT3.

PANEL – SEE OUR EARLIER COMMENT ON THIS POINT AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN OUR REPORT.

- 3.7 **RDF1** – as our Briefing Paper 6 suggests, the articulation of policy in the regional spatial framework in terms of centres, urban areas and settlements cuts across the sub-area focus of Part 4 policies and it is difficult to read the two together. There are also more specific inconsistencies such as:

- City Regions – final sentences of paras 12.2 and 13.2 accord priority / focus for development activity between the city regions that is not immediately evident in RDF1.

NWRA – earlier debates at the EIP explored whether there was a need for explicit prioritisation of the sub-regions to be included in RDF1. The sentences at paragraphs 12.2, 13.2 (and 14.2 incidentally) do not set out a priority but set out a statement that relates the relative relationship between the sub regions

PANEL – WE ARE CONTENT WITH THESE SENTENCES WHICH WE THINK SET OUT THE SITUATION FACTUALLY. WE HAVE NOT RECOMMENDED THAT THERE SHOULD BE ANY “HIERARCHY” BUT IT WAS GENERALLY ACCEPTED AT THE EIP THAT THE CITY REGIONS DO IN FACT HAVE DIFFERENT ROLES AND WE THINK THAT 12.2, 13.2 AND 14.2 SET THESE OUT. WE HAVE REFERRED TO THEM IN OUR REPORT.

- Regional Centres – MCR2 and LCR2 both reflect the emphasis in RDF1 on the Manchester / Salford and Liverpool Regional Centres, but in the latter case the term is used interchangeably with Liverpool City Centre. This is confusing.

NWRA – Agree that the references could be changed to refer to the Regional Centre in the LCR policies.

PANEL – WE HAVE DEALT WITH THIS POINT IN OUR COMMENTS ON POLICY LCR2.

- Inner area – the emphasis on the inner areas (called “surrounding” inner area in LCR2) is not apparent in RDF1.

NWRA acknowledged the need to include a reference to Inner Areas in Policy RDF1 at earlier sessions of the EIP.

PANEL – SEE OUR COMMENTS ON POLICY RDF1.

- Regional towns and cities – there is no distinction in RDF1 between settlements in the north and south of MCR. RDF1 allows “complementary” development in the regional towns and cities (incl Altrincham, Stockport and Northwich) whereas MCR3 allows for only local / affordable needs and to support agreed regeneration strategies. It is also not clear whether the requirement of “complementarity” in RDF1 bullet two is additional to the requirements of part 4 policies. For example, is it an extra requirement on top of MCR5 (Warrington) or does MCR5 rather explain what “complementary” means?

NWRA – it is entirely consistent to include the term complementary in RDF1 which is then explained in greater detail in the sub-regional policy frameworks.

PANEL – SEE OUR PROPOSED CHANGES TO POLICY RDF1. IN OUR VIEW THE CITY REGION POLICES SIT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE RDF POLICIES AND IF THE WORD “COMPLEMENTARY” WERE TO REMAIN, COMPLEMENTARITY WOULD APPLY TO ALL RELEVANT SETTLEMENTS.

3.8 **RDF3** – the bundling together of all Key Service Centres (KSCs) in terms of fulfilling local needs (RDF3) is at odds with

- CNL1 bullet one which focuses major development in West Cumbria (a collection of KSCs); CNL1 bullet two which refers to moderate levels of development; CNL2 bullet four in respect of Kendal and Penrith;
- CLCR3 which allows development in settlements outside the regional towns and cities appropriate to their “scale and function”. It is not clear whether these are just the KSCs, but even if they are, there is an inconsistency since RDF3 says development should be of a “scale and nature appropriate to fulfil the needs of local communities”.

NWRA – As mentioned above the KSCs are not bundled together and where detail is required for particular settlements this has been provided in the sub-regional policy frameworks.

PANEL – SEE OUR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON POLICY RDF3. WE HAVE TO ACCEPT THAT THIS POLICY IS IN A TRANSITIONAL STATE.

4. Inconsistencies between Part 4 policies
- 4.1 Because the policies in Part 4 have largely been drawn from very separate pieces of work at sub-regional level, there are inconsistencies in terminology and the way visions are articulated and cross references made, as well as topic coverage and policy content. It is unclear if these reflect different policy responses to different problems and opportunities or simply result from different terms of reference and approach. For example:

Terminology:

- policy LCR2 is couched in terms of Liverpool city centre and surrounding inner area, whereas MCR2 talks of the Regional Centre and inner areas. Why are the title and first two paras of MCR2 expressed differently to the title and first para of LCR2 when the only significant difference in approach concerns the treatment of professional services in LCR2?

NWRA – Agree that the use of Regional Centre in the LCR policies would be appropriate. Agree that "inner area" could be used for consistency in MCR and LCR policies.

PANEL – WE HAVE RECOMMENDED ALTERING THE TITLE OF POLICY LCR2 TO ACCORD WITH POLICY MCR2. WE ACCEPT THE REMAINING DIFFERENCES WHICH WE BELIEVE RESULT PRIMARILY FROM THE PROCESS NWRA WENT THROUGH IN DRAWING UP THE SUB-REGIONAL POLICIES – THE POLICIES WILL CHANGE FURTHER IF OUR RECOMMENDATIONS ARE ACCEPTED AS A RESULT OF EVENTS AT THE EIP.

- similar concepts are sometimes articulated at city region and sub-area levels in different ways eg MCR1 bullets two and three and MCR2 and 4. This repetition makes policy more difficult to understand and gives scope for different interpretations. There is less repetition between LCR1 and subsequent LCR policies. However, the wording of bullet three in LCR1 and the last bullet in LCR3 is confusing and potentially inconsistent;

NWRA – MCR1/LCR1 provide the over-arching hooks that are then dealt with in more detail in the MCR and LCR policies that follow.

PANEL - IN OUR EFFORTS TO REVISE POLICIES TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE AGMA AND MPU VERSIONS WE TRIED TO AVOID FURTHER DIVERGENCE BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT SUB- REGIONS BY RETAINING VERY LARGELY THE RSS VERSIONS AS AMENDED IN BRIEFING PAPER 20. RETAINING A DEGREE OF CONSISTENCY WAS ONE OF OUR REASONS FOR DOING THIS. HOWEVER IN MAKING CHANGES TO REFLECT THOSE PARTS OF THE ALTERNATIVE VERSIONS WHICH WERE GENERALLY SUPPORTED OR WHICH SEEMED TO US TO OFFER AN IMPROVEMENT WE HAVE IN PLACES INTRODUCED BIGGER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SUB-REGIONS. IN DOING THIS WE HAVE BEEN CONSCIOUS OF BOTH OF THE ABOVE TWO POINTS. WE BELIEVE THAT DESPITE THESE DIFFERENCES THE POLICIES WE HAVE RECOMMENDED ARE CLEAR, ESPECIALLY WHEN SEEN – AS THEY MUST BE – IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RSS AS A WHOLE. AS WE HAVE ALREADY INDICATED THE ORIGINAL RSS APPROACH (CHAPTER 2 OF THE TECHNICAL APPENDIX) INEVITABLY MEANT SOME DIFFERENCES OF APPROACH AND WE DO NOT THINK THIS IS A SERIOUS PROBLEM.

- the Manchester / Salford regional centre is defined in footnote 202. The Liverpool regional centre is only defined in conjunction with the surrounding inner areas (footnote 213);

NWRA – Agree, need to add definition for Liverpool regional centre which can be discussed at Matter 8 given the suggested definition from Merseyside Policy Unit

PANEL – SEE OUR RECOMMENDATIONS ON MCR AND LCR POLICIES AND TEXT.

- most Part 4 policies start “plans and strategies will...” but CNL2 says “should”. LCR2, CLCR2, and CLCR3 are formulated differently. Why, and is it of significance?

NWRA – Agree, can change should to will.

PANEL - WE HAVE RECOMMENDED THAT ALL THE POLICIES SHOULD START WITH “SHOULD”. THIS IS BASED ON THE LEGAL OPINION WHICH NWRA OBTAINED (REF EIP/NWRA/11).

Visions:

- the visions for the different sub-regions are articulated very differently. There is no vision for Cumbria / N Lancs sub-region but rather a set of spatial objectives for Cumbria, and no vision for South Cheshire. The LCR and MCR visions have different time horizons (2025) from Draft RSS. There are no outcome targets in the Monitoring and Implementation Framework to measure performance against these visions.

NWRA – The visions for MCR and LCR have been derived from partnership work on CRDPs and sub-regional policies for RSS. The timeline to 2025 will not be a problem given the need to review RSS. At the time of developing the sub-regional frameworks for Cumbria/North Lancashire and South Cheshire specific visions had not been developed but future reviews could incorporate where needed.

PANEL – “VISIONS” SEEM TO RELATE TO THE CITY REGIONS ONLY. WE SEE NO NEED FOR A VISION FOR SOUTH CHESHIRE AT THIS STAGE PENDING THE CROSS BORDER STUDY WITH NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE WHICH IS PROPOSED. A VISION FOR THE WHOLE OF THAT SUB REGION MAY THEN BE APPROPRIATE. ON CUMBRIA NO VISION HAS BEEN PROPOSED BUT THERE WAS NO CALL FOR ONE IN EVIDENCE OR AT THE EIP.

WE WOULD HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH THE VISIONS’ END DATE OF 2025 BEING CHANGED TO 2021 THOUGH WE STRUGGLE TO THINK OF WAYS IN WHICH THE WORLD MIGHT BE ANY DIFFERENT AS A RESULT.

WE DO NOT THINK IT IS THE VISIONS THAT NEED TO BE MONITORED BUT THE SPECIFIC POLICIES AND PROPOSALS, WHICH LEND THEMSELVES TO DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS AND WHICH ARE THE MEANS BY WHICH THE VISIONS SHOULD BE ACHIEVED.

Cross references:

Cross-referencing could be useful if it drew the readers’ attention to all relevant policies that have a sub-regional dimension in a consistent way (a sort of sub-regional index) but this is not the case. For example:

- there are consistent references to RT1, RT8 and RT3 (except Carlisle) but RT4 is only mentioned in the context of the Mersey Ports and Heysham. Only the West Cheshire policy (LCR4) mentions specific transport corridors;

- only MCR4 and LCR3 cross-reference housing policies (L3 and 4);
- MCR3, MCR5, LCR3, CLCR1, CNL1 and CNL4 cross-reference W2 whilst LCR2 and MCR2 refer to specific broad locations by name. LCR4 and CH1 do neither. Only MCR2, LCR3 and CLCR1 cross-reference W3. No part 4 policies cross-refer to W5, W6 or W8 – all of which articulate sub-regional priorities in one way or another;

NWRA – in line with paragraph 1.3 of submitted draft RSS; "Cross-referencing within the policies has been kept to instances where explicit policy linkages need to be highlighted." Paragraph 3.14 of the Panel Report into the Partial Review of RPG13 suggested that cross references be used very sparingly.

PANEL - WE AGREE WITH THE PREVIOUS PANEL THAT CROSS REFERENCING SHOULD BE KEPT TO A MINIMUM. IT CAN NEVER BE COMPLETE – ALL THE POLICIES ARE INTER-DEPENDENT – AND IT CAN BE CONFUSING.

Topic coverage:

- LCR2 bullet four refers to a proposed regional park but MCR and CLCR policies do not. This is despite the fact that, in the case of MCR, para 12.5 of the supporting text specifically mentions regional park and community forest resources in the context of green infrastructure;

NWRA – Need to consider any potential redrafting in the light of MPU's submissions for LCR policies.

PANEL – SEE OUR PROPOSALS – WE ARE CONTENT WITH WHAT IS SUGGESTED.

- LCR3 and CNL1 refer to local centres but others, for example, CLCR3 and MCR4 do not;

NWRA – The difficulty faced in RSS is to what level of detail to provide policy. The only instance where settlements not featured in Table 7.1 are included is in LCR3, whereas CNL1 refers to the need for local centres to be identified by LDFs. The revised LCR3 policy from MPU suggests a number of local centres to be named. The Assembly would suggest that naming local centres in RSS provides too detailed a layer of policy, but have included a suggested revision in Briefing Paper 20a with regard to a possible local centres framework policy for RSS. If the policy is included in the proposed

revisions to RSS, it may negate the need for references in LCR3 and CNL1.

PANEL - SEE OUR RECOMMENDATIONS ON KSCs AND OUR COMMENTS IN THE SUB-REGIONAL CHAPTERS.

- Both LCR3 (northern LCR) and LCR4 (W Cheshire) set out policy for Ellesmere Port.

NWRA - Need to consider any potential redrafting in the light of the Assembly's Briefing Paper on West Cheshire and North East Wales and the forthcoming debate at the EIP.

PANEL - SEE OUR COMMENTS IN THE LCR CHAPTER. WE ACCEPT THIS SITUATION.

Policy content:

- the focus on the Pathfinder area in bullet one of LCR2 is not matched by a similar emphasis in MCR2 and is expressed differently in CLCR1;

NWRA – would not agree that emphasis is lacking and would question why a problem is identified in expressing issues in different ways for each HMR area.

PANEL – SEE OUR RECOMMENDATIONS ON MCR AND LCR – WE ARE CONTENT WITH THE REFERENCES THERE TO THE PATHFINDER AREAS.

- MCR4 bullet two promotes a range of accessible, high quality employment sites. Why does LCR3 not do the same? MCR2 penultimate para emphasises a good range of high quality housing. Why do LCR2 and CLCR2 not do the same? Do such broad brush policies add value at the sub-regional level?

NWRA – Agree that there could be improvement in consistent wording which in part may be met by the suggested changes coming forward from participants.

PANEL – WE HAVE RECOMMENDED ALTERING POLICY MCR4 BROADLY ALONG THE LINES OF THE AGMA ALTERNATIVE VERSION. THIS WIDENS THE GAP BETWEEN THE TWO SETS OF POLICIES BUT WE ARE CONTENT WITH THIS – IT IS A RESULT OF THE CONSULTATIVE APPROACH.

ON THE SECOND POINT HOWEVER WE AGREE AND HAVE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO POLICIES LCR2 AND CLCR1.

- MCR1 specifically seeks to enhance the accessibility of the Regional Centre. In LCR1 bullet 8, it is the city centre that is mentioned in this context and for all modes rather than just public transport;

NWRA – Agree that the wording could be changed to be consistent.

PANEL – WE HAVE SUGGESTED CHANGES TO DEAL WITH THIS.

- unlike MCR2, there is no LCR policy on residential development in the regional / city centre. Does this reflect a different policy imperative?

NWRA – Reflects the policy development undertaken with partners in each of the city regions. Sub-regional policy is not about a one size fits all template.

PANEL – WE AGREE AND HAVE SUGGESTED AN ADDITION TO POLICY LCR2.

- MCR policies distinguish between residential development and economic development – giving priority to the former in inner areas. LCR policies give little specific advice on the location of residential development but seek to focus development generally in northern parts to address need (para 13.5). This is a very different approach to MCR which gives more weight to building on success at key locations in the south. The justification for these different stances is not clear;

NWRA - Reflects the policy development undertaken with partners in each of the city regions.

PANEL – WE HAVE SUGGESTED CHANGES HERE, BUT WE ACCEPT THAT THERE MAY BE DIFFERENCES IN APPROACH BETWEEN THE SUB-REGIONS.

- only LCR1 specifically mentions worklessness but there are concentrations elsewhere in other sub-regions;

NWRA – Issue is covered in W1 and supporting text of draft RSS at 8.4. The need for further wording in the sub-regions can be discussed at the EIP with all participants.

PANEL – WE AGREE AND HAVE SUGGESTED AN ADDITION TO POLICY MCR1 TO COVER WORKLESSNESS.

- CLCR1 and CNL2 cite specific delivery tools in policy (eg Preston Vision and Carlisle Renaissance) but MCR and LCR policies do not;

NWRA – specific references included as a result of consultation responses draft RSS (prior to the full public consultation).

PANEL – WE DO NOT THINK THE RSS AS PART OF THE STATUTORY DEVELOPMENT PLAN SHOULD INCLUDE A COMMITMENT TO NON STATUTORY PROPOSALS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN SUBJECT TO SA/SEA OR TO FULL PUBLIC SCRUTINY. WE RECOMMEND THE DELETION OF REFERENCE TO THESE STRATEGIES FROM POLICIES CLCR1 AND CNL2.

- first para in MCR2 talks about the Manchester / Salford regional centre as the primary economic driver in the city region, but the first sentence in 12.6 says the regional centre will continue to be the primary economic driver in the North West;

NWRA – paragraph 12.6 also refers to the city region.

PANEL – WE FIND OURSELVES UNABLE TO BECOME EXERCISED ABOUT THIS VERY MINOR POINT.

- MCR 2 bullet two refers to housing making a positive contribution towards the regional centre, whereas para 12.6 talks about avoiding a negative impact on its commercial, retail, leisure, cultural and tourism status.

NWRA – no conflict as the paragraph merely sets out the need to ensure residential development proportionate to the commercial etc function of the Regional Centre.

PANEL – WE ARE CONTENT WITH THE NWRA RESPONSE HERE.

Appendix C Final List of Matters and Participants EiP Timetable and Panel Questions

Matters and Participants

Matter 1. Vision, Objectives and Overall Approach

Matter 1A: Vision and Objectives

- (i) Are the overall vision and objectives in the draft RSS appropriate and do they adequately cover the characteristics and issues of the whole region?
- (ii) Does the draft RSS provide an appropriate, realisable and sustainable strategy for the region, having regard to national objectives / policy, key strategic issues and factors influencing change?

Matter 1B: Spatial Principles

- (i) Does the draft RSS set out the right underlying principles for spatial planning in the region?
- (ii) Are the different elements of DP1 clearly stated, and how will they be monitored?
- (iii) Is the sequential approach in DP1 appropriate?

Matter 1C: Assumptions Underpinning the Draft RSS

- (i) Are the economic assumptions (including growth and activity rates) in draft RSS appropriate and achievable?
- (ii) Are the assumptions about population change in draft RSS appropriate?
- (iii) Are the economic, population and other assumptions consistent between the regional and sub-regional policies in the draft RSS?
- (iv) Are the national and regional constraints on development clearly articulated? Are the development proposals consistent with Green Belt, flood risk policies and other constraints such as transport, water supply and sewerage infrastructure?

Matter 1D: Overall Approach

- (i) Does the draft RSS align with the Regional Economic Strategy, the Regional Housing Strategy and Regional Funding Allocation advice?
- (ii) Does the draft RSS properly reflect the Northern Way and other relevant strategies?

- (iii) Are the separate objectives of the Regional Transport Strategy appropriate and how do they link to the overall draft RSS objectives, spatial principles and the spatial framework?

Matter 1E: Sustainability

- (i) Are the Sustainability Appraisal and the Strategic Environmental Assessment robust?
- (ii) Does the draft RSS achieve the right balance between economic growth, social inclusion, including equality and diversity issues and environmental protection / enhancement?
- (iii) Do the proposals in the draft RSS sufficiently provide for tackling climate change and mitigating for its impact?
- (iv) Does the draft RSS provide a framework that can meet the aim of reducing the need to travel?

Participants Matter 1A-E

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	Northwest Regional Development Agency (498)	5	The Northern Way (561)
6	Cheshire County Council (426)	7	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)
8	Cumbria County Council (715)	9	Lancashire County Council (538)
10	AGMA (531)	11	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)/Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)
12	Cheshire Association of Local Councils (427)	13	Natural England (509)/Environment Agency (585) (Hot seating)
14	TCPA (566)	15	Home Builders Federation (515)
16	North West Transport Activist Roundtable (556)	17	North West Environment Link (628)
18	FOE (1 seat to be taken by Manchester, S Cheshire or NW FOE)	19	Brethren Gospel Trust (530)
20	Persimmon Homes Plc (565) (<i>GVA Grimley</i>)	21	North West Development Consortium (506)/ Paycause Ltd (568) (<i>Barton Willmore</i>)

Matter 2. Spatial Strategy

Matter 2A: Overall Spatial Strategy

- (i) Does the draft RSS sufficiently express a spatial strategy that addresses the region's priorities for growth, regeneration and investment? Does policy RDF1 provide sufficient detail on the spatial priorities for main development locations?
- (ii) Do the thematic policies and sub-regional policies amount to a consistent and coherent regional strategy?
- (iii) Does the spatial strategy provide a framework for improving accessibility to jobs and services particularly by sustainable modes for all parts of the region?
- (iv) Is it appropriate for the draft RSS to omit the previous designation of Regeneration Priority Areas?
- (v) Is the Key Diagram fit for purpose and do the Sub-regional Diagrams add value?

Matter 2B: City Regions

- (i) Does the City Region approach adequately address the different pressures and needs of the various parts of the region or are there alternative sub-regional approaches, which better reflect these needs and pressures?

Should there be greater clarity about:

- a) The geographic extent of the three city regions;
 - b) The broad scale of development they should accommodate; and
 - c) Their role in relation to each other and to towns beyond the city regions such as Carlisle and Crewe?
- (ii) Are the City Regions to be treated as being equal or is there a hierarchy?

Matter 2C: Locations for Development

- (i) Is the evidence base for Table 7.1 sound? Should the proposed settlement hierarchy be reassessed, and should a consistent approach be adopted toward the identification of Key Service Centres?
- (ii) When, and in what circumstances will there be a need for a review of the Green Belt?

Participants Matters 2A-C

1- 2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	Northwest Regional Development Agency (498)	5	The Northern Way (561)
6	Cheshire County Council (426)	7	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)
8	Cumbria County Council (715)	9	Lancashire County Council (538)
10	AGMA (531)	11	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)/Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)
12	North West Rural Community Councils (474)	13	Cheshire Association of Local Councils (427)
14	Preston Vision (544)	15	Peel Holdings (629)
16	North West Environment Link (628)	17	Lancashire Economic Partnership (479)
18	North West Transport Activist Roundtable (556)	19	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)
20	Maro Developments (478)/ NJW Developments Ltd (734)/ Redrow Homes North West Ltd (469) (<i>Northern Planning</i>)	21	North West Development Consortium (506)/ Paycause Ltd (568) (<i>Barton Willmore</i>)

Matter 2D: Rural Issues

- (i) Are rural issues, including the development needs of small towns, adequately addressed in the draft RSS?

Participants Matter 2D

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	Cumbria County Council (715)
6	Cheshire County Council (426)	7	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)
8	AGMA (531)	9	Lancashire County Council (538)
10	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361) / Blackpool (397)/Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)	11	North West Rural Community Councils (474)
12	Cumbria Association of Local Councils (399)	13	North West Rural Affairs Forum (738)
14	National Farmers Union (567)	15	North West Planning Aid (385)
16	NW Public Transport Users Forum Travelwatch NW (466)	17	County Land & Business Association (384)
18	North West Transport Activist Roundtable (556)	19	North West Environment Link (628)
20	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)	21	North West Development Consortium (506)/ Paycause Ltd (568) (<i>Barton Willmore</i>)

Matter 3. Working in the North West

Matter 3A: Economic Development

- (i) Is there a sound evidence base for the employment land provisions set out in Tables 8.2 and 8.3?
- (ii) Should the draft RSS set out employment land provision at a district level as well as the sub-regional level?
- (iii) On what basis have the broad locations for regionally significant economic development in Table 8.1 been selected and are the locations sustainable? Do they reflect the regional spatial framework and sub-regional policy framework in the draft RSS. How do they reflect and reinforce the spatial distribution of economic growth, regeneration priorities, and the broad housing locations, and what are the transport implications? (Note – for

- the avoidance of doubt the Parkside Colliery proposal falls within this policy)
- (iv) Are the land designations in W2 focused enough in terms of use, or will they allow for significant B1 office development, which could undermine more sustainable town/city centre locations?
 - (v) Is there sufficient clarity regarding the types and scale of development, which will be permitted on reserve sites? Do current trends in inward investment support the retention of reserve sites for “large scale manufacturing”?

Participants Matter 3A

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	Northern Way (561)
6	AGMA (531)	7	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)
8	Lancashire CC (538)	9	Cheshire CC (426)
10	Cumbria CC (715)	11	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)/Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)
12	English Partnerships (505)	13	NW Public Transport User Forum Travelwatch NW (466)
14	Cumbria Strategic Partnership (735)	15	New East Manchester Ltd (728)
16	Chambers of Commerce North West (398)	17	Directors of Public Health for Greater Manchester (425)
18	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)	19	North West Environment Link (628)
20	Haworth Estates (504) (DTZ)	21	AstraZeneca (514) (CB Richard Ellis)
22	Parkside Action Group (268) (3A (iii))	23	Astral Developments Ltd (400) (RPS) (3A (iii))

Matter 3B: Retail

- (i) Have the appropriate centres been listed in policy W5?
- (ii) Should a more hierarchical approach be adopted?
- (iii) Is the floor space requirement shown in Table 8.4 realistic?

Participants Matter 3B

1- 2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	Northern Way (561)
6	AGMA (531)	7	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)
8	Lancashire County Council (538)	9	Cheshire County Council (426)
10	Cumbria County Council (715)	11	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)/Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573)
12	Preston City Council, Chester City Council, Carlisle City Council (468)	13	English Partnerships (505)
14	Tesco Stores Ltd (497) <i>(Development Planning Partnership)</i>	15	North West Transport Activists Roundtable (556)
16	North West Environment Link (628)	17	Haworth Estates (504) (DTZ)
18	Grosvenor (587) <i>(Cushman & Wakefield)</i>		

Matter 3C: Casinos

- (i) Is the approach to casinos in Policy W8 of the draft RSS appropriate?

Participants Matter 3C

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	AGMA (531)
6	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)	7	Blackpool Council (397)
8	Manchester City Council	9	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361) /Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)
10	ReBlackpool (729)	11	North East Manchester Ltd. (728)
12	Culture Northwest (496)	13	Lancashire Economic Partnership (479)
14	North West Police Forces (620)		

Matter 4. Living in the North West

Matter 4A: Overall Housing Strategy

- (i) Is the methodology and evidence base underpinning the scale and distribution of housing in policy L4 sound? Does the amount and distribution of housing reflect and reinforce proposals for the spatial distribution of economic growth and regeneration priorities (including HMRA's)? Does the distribution of housing reflect the draft RSS's regional and sub-regional spatial framework?
- (ii) Does the draft RSS need to be more flexible in terms of the housing provision to ensure it can respond to changes over the Plan period?
- (iii) Is the use of maximum targets (net of clearance replacement) for housing completions appropriate in all areas, or is there a need for flexibility to enable planning permissions or completions to be used as a basis to measure the annualised housing requirement against targets?
- (iv) Should the draft RSS include indicative phasing of the housing figures set out in Table 9.1?

- (v) Do the housing policies reflect emerging national guidance? Will they help to provide affordable housing and achieve balanced housing markets?

Matter 4B: Sustainable Communities

- (i) Will the draft RSS help to secure mixed, cohesive, sustainable communities?
(ii) Are health and education issues adequately addressed in the draft RSS?

Participants Matter 4A & 4B

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	Northern Way (561)
6	AGMA (531)	7	Lancashire County Council (538)
8	Cheshire County Council (426)	9	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)
10	Cumbria County Council (715)	11	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)/Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)
12	Directors of Public Health for Greater Manchester (425)	13	Manchester Joint Health Unit (357)
14	English Partnerships (505)	15	Shelter (539)
16	Elevate East Lancashire (731)	17	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)
18	FOE (1 seat to be taken by Manchester, S Cheshire or NW FOE)	19	North West Environmental Link (628)
20	Home Builders Federation (515)	21	Redrow Homes North West Ltd (469) (<i>Northern Planning</i>)
22	Persimmon Homes Plc (565) (<i>GVA Grimley</i>)	23	North West Development Consortium (506)/ Paycause Ltd (568) (<i>Barton Willmore</i>)

Matter 5. Regional Transport Strategy

Matter 5A: Overall Transport Strategy

- (i) Does the Regional Transport Strategy provide an appropriate long-term framework for highways and public transport in the region, reflecting other RSS policies and the RES?
- (ii) How will the draft RSS's proposed patterns of development impact on the strategic highway and public transport networks?

Matter 5B: Demand Management

- (i) Does the draft RSS provide clear and sufficient guidance on what is meant by demand management and when and where such measures might be used?

Matter 5C: Transport Investment and Management Priorities

- (i) How do transport investment priorities, as set out in Tables 10.2 a-e address RSS and RES objectives? Do they take account of the likely resources available to deliver them?
- (ii) How could Policy RT8 and Tables 10.2 a-e be improved in terms of setting achievable outcomes for transport improvements?

Matter 5D: Airports

- (i) Does Policy RT3 provide a sustainable strategic context for the development of and surface access to the region's airports, and is it consistent with other policies in the draft RSS and national policy context including the Air Transport White Paper (2003?)

Participants Matter 5

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	Northern Way (561)
6	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)	7	AGMA (531)
8	Cumbria County Council (715)	9	Lancashire County Council (538)
10	Cheshire County Council (426)	11	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)/Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)
12	Highways Agency	13	Network Rail
14	Northern Rail (261)	15	FirstGroup plc (523)
16	Merseytravel (208)	17	GMPTE

18	Travelwatch NW (formerly NW Public Transport Users Forum) (466)	19	North West Transport Activist Roundtable (556)
20	RSPB (41)	21	FOE (1 seat to be taken by Manchester, S Cheshire or NW FOE)
22	Peel Holdings (629)	23	Manchester Airport (648)
24	Blackpool Airport (719)		

Matter 6. Enjoying and Managing the North West

Matter 6A: Environment and Landscape

- (i) Should separate policies be used in this chapter to cover the individual aspects of (a) integrated land management incorporating woodland/forestry, (b) biodiversity and (c) landscape and heritage (culture)?” Are the policy tests sufficiently explicit?
- (ii) Does the draft RSS provide an appropriate steer in relation to green infrastructure aspirations and requirements? How will this policy be implemented?
- (iii) Does the draft RSS take adequate account of the need to consider the implications of development in areas of flood risk?
- (iv) Are water resources and the capacity of both water and sewerage infrastructure adequately considered in the draft RSS?

Participants Matter 6A

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	AGMA (531)
6	Cheshire County Council (426)	7	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)
8	Cumbria County Council (715)	9	Lancashire County Council (538)
10	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)/ Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)	11	Natural England (509) (6A (i) & (ii)/ Environment Agency (585) (6A (iii) & (iv) (Hot seating)
12	English Heritage (467)	13	United Utilities (430)
14	Home Builders Federation (515)	15	FOE (1 seat to be taken by Manchester, S Cheshire or NW FOE)
16	RSPB (41)	17	National Trust (736)

18	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)	19	NPL Estates (501)/Miller Homes (NW) Ltd (500)/Barratt (Manchester) (527) (How Planning LLP)
----	---	----	--

Matter 6B: Minerals and Waste

- (i) Is the evidence base used to inform the capacity requirements set out in Tables 11.3, 11.4 and 11.5 robust?
- (ii) Are the waste policies in the draft RSS consistent with PPS10? If not, what changes should be made to the draft RSS?
- (iii) Is there a need for the draft RSS to provide a clearer spatial direction in terms of waste apportionment and waste management facilities that will be required at the regional and sub-regional level; eg should RSS advise on the broad location of facilities?
- (iv) Is the inclusion of peat as a mineral reserve to be extracted appropriate?

Participants Matter 6B

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)	5	Cheshire County Council (426)
6	Cumbria County Council (715)	7	Lancashire County Council (538)
8	AGMA (531)	9	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)/Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)
10	Regional Technical Advisory Board	11	Environment Agency (585)
12	North West Waste Forum (632)	13	North West Community Waste Network (712)
14	FOE (1 seat to be taken by Manchester, S Cheshire or NW FOE)	15	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)
16	Envirolink Northwest's Remade Project (713)	17	Viridor Waste Management (533)
18	Waste Recycling Ltd (559)	19	Banks Development (294)
20	Peel Holdings (629)	21	RSPB (41) (6B(iv))
22	Growing Media Association (6B(iv))		

Matter 6C: Energy

- (i) Are the renewable energy policies consistent with national guidance?
- (ii) Is the draft RSS sufficiently compatible with the outcome of the Energy Review 2006?
- (iii) Are the renewable energy targets set out in EM17 and Tables 11.6 and 11.7 sufficiently justified and achievable?
- (iv) Does the draft RSS provide appropriate guidance on the need to reduce demand and increase energy efficiency?

Participants Matter 6C

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)	5	Cheshire County Council (426)
6	Cumbria County Council (715)	7	Lancashire County Council (538)
8	AGMA (531)	9	1 seat for Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)/Warrington (622)/ Lake District National Park Authority (573) (Hot seating)
10	Home Builders Federation (515)	11	Renewables North West
12	Npower Renewables Ltd (492)	13	SP Manweb of Scottish Power & Norweb of United Utilites (637)
14	Furness Enterprise Limited (723)	15	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)
16	FOE		

Matter 7. Manchester City Region and South Cheshire

(The main discussion on Warrington will take place at this session, although it may also be discussed under Matter 8)

All District Councils in the Manchester City Region have been invited to attend the session. Under Matter 7A Districts will have the opportunity to raise issues relating to matters discussed earlier in the EIP. They should however ensure that debate is restricted to matters of a strategic nature. They should avoid unnecessary repetition, and to this end it would be useful if they attended relevant earlier sessions in which they have an interest.

Matter 7A: Sub-regional Strategy

- (i) Does the strategy communicate a clear, sustainable and appropriate vision for the sub-region? If not how should the strategy be modified? In particular:
- do the proposals for employment, housing, transport and the environment amount collectively to a coherent and appropriate vision for the sub-region;
 - are the proposals for employment land (of various kinds) appropriate and achievable;
 - are the transport proposals adequate and logical in relation to the strategy as a whole;
 - is adequate attention paid to issues of climate change and the protection of the environment;
 - are there any other material deficiencies, which you perceive in the plan as it affects the sub-region;
 - do you believe the proposals to be deliverable, through the development plan system or in other ways;
 - the extent to which cross-border issues have been considered, especially in relation to High Peak;
 - how will the sub-regional sub-area priorities be monitored.
- (ii) Is there an inconsistency in the strategy as it affects the Manchester City Region in that most of the economic opportunities are said to be in the southern part whereas most of the housing is not? If so does this raise issues of sustainability?
- (iii) Are there any issues affecting the South Cheshire sub-region which might require the plan to be modified

Matter 7B: Housing Issues

- (i) Is the sub-region's housing provision and distribution appropriate and achievable? Are the PDL targets in Table 9.1 realistic, deliverable, and based on robust evidence?

Participants Matter 7

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	AGMA (531)
6	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)	7	Cheshire County Council (426)
8	Macclesfield BC (613)	9	Vale Royal BC (711)
10	High Peak BC	11	Salford City Council (560)
12	Trafford MBC (570)	13	Warrington BC (622)

14	Crewe & Nantwich BC (360)	15	Manchester City Council
16	Bolton MBC	17	Stockport MBC
18	Oldham Council	19	Wigan Council
20	Tameside MBC	21	Rochdale MBC
22	Bury MBC	23	West Midlands Regional Assembly (525) (7A (iii))
24	Oldham & Rochdale Pathfinder (548)	25	Directors of Public Health for Greater Manchester (425)
26	Friends of Peak District (703)	27	FOE (1 seat to be taken by Manchester, S Cheshire or NW FOE)
28	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)	29	Manchester Airport (648)
30	Persimmon Homes Plc (565) (<i>GVA Grimley</i>)	31	Jennings Estates (545) (<i>RPS Planning</i>)
32	Congleton BC (718)		

Matter 8. Liverpool City Region

All District Councils in the Liverpool City Region have been invited to attend the session. Under Matter 8A Districts will have the opportunity to raise issues relating to matters discussed earlier in the EIP. They should however ensure that debate is restricted to matters of a strategic nature. They should avoid unnecessary repetition, and to this end it would be useful if they attended relevant earlier sessions in which they have an interest.

Matter 8A: Sub-regional Strategy

- (i) Does the strategy communicate a clear, sustainable and appropriate vision for the sub-region? If not how should the strategy be modified? In particular:
- do the proposals for employment, housing, transport and the environment amount collectively to a coherent and appropriate vision for the sub-region;
 - are the proposals for employment land (of various kinds) appropriate and achievable;
 - are the transport proposals adequate and logical in relation to the strategy as a whole;
 - is adequate attention paid to issues of climate change and the protection of the environment;
 - are there any other material deficiencies which you perceive in the plan as it affects the sub-region;

- do you believe the proposals to be deliverable, through the development plan system or in other ways;
 - how will the sub-regional sub-area priorities be monitored.
- (ii) Does LCR4 adequately reflect the policies and strategy emerging from the West Cheshire/ North East Wales Sub-Regional Strategy?

Matter 8B: Housing Issues

- (i) Is the sub-region’s housing provision and distribution appropriate and achievable? Are the PDL targets in Table 9.1 realistic, deliverable, and based on robust evidence?

Participants Matter 8

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	AGMA (531)
6	Cheshire County Council (426)	7	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)
8	Chester City Council (493)	9	Ellesmere Port & Neston BC (428)
10	West Lancashire DC (642)	11	Halton BC (429)
12	Liverpool City Council (640)	13	Wirral BC (424)
14	Warrington BC (622)	15	St Helens BC
16	Sefton BC (522)	17	Knowsley BC (618)
18	The Welsh Assembly	19	NewHeartlands Pathfinder
20	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)	21	FOE
22	North West Development Consortium (506)/Paycause Ltd (568) (<i>Barton Willmore</i>)	23	Peel Holdings (629)

Matter 9. Central Lancashire City Region

All District Councils in the Central Lancashire City Region have been invited to attend the session. Under Matter 9A Districts will have the opportunity to raise issues relating to matters discussed earlier in the EIP. They should however ensure that debate is restricted to matters of a strategic nature. They should avoid unnecessary repetition, and to this end it would be useful if they attended relevant earlier sessions in which they have an interest.

Matter 9A: Sub-regional Strategy

- (i) Does the strategy communicate a clear, sustainable and appropriate vision for the sub-region? If not how should the strategy be modified? In particular:
- do the proposals for employment, housing, transport and the environment amount collectively to a coherent and appropriate vision for the sub-region;
 - are the proposals for employment land (of various kinds) appropriate and achievable;
 - are the transport proposals adequate and logical in relation to the strategy as a whole;
 - is adequate attention paid to issues of climate change and the protection of the environment;
 - are there any other material deficiencies, which you perceive in the plan as it affects the sub-region;
 - do you believe the proposals to be deliverable, through the development plan system or in other ways;
 - the extent to which cross-border issues have been considered;
 - how will the sub-regional sub-area priorities be monitored.
- (ii) Does the Central Lancashire City Region have any coherence in functional, social/cultural, geographic or economic terms?
- (iii) Should the draft RSS provide a more proactive and coherent framework for the regeneration of the East Lancashire Towns?

Matter 9B: Housing Issues

- (i) Is the sub-region's housing provision and distribution appropriate and achievable? Are the PDL targets in Table 9.1 realistic, deliverable, and based on robust evidence?

Participants Matter 9

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	Lancashire County Council (538)
6	AGMA (531)	7	Pendle BC (590)
8	Blackpool Council (397)	9	Blackburn With Darwen (361)
10	Burnley BC (697)	11	Fylde BC (649)
12	Ribble Valley BC (489)	13	Hyndburn BC (714)
14	Chorley BC	15	Rosendale BC (707)
16	South Ribble BC	17	Preston CC
18	Wyre BC	19	Lancs. Economic Partnership (479)

20	Preston Vision (544)	21	BAE Systems (572)
22	Grosvenor (587)	23	Elevate East Lancs. (731)
24	Heap Land Partnership (319)	25	NW Rural Community Councils (474)
26	NW Planning Aid (385)	27	Chambers of Commerce NW (398)
28	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)	29	North West Environmental Link (628)
30	Prime Resorts Limited and Persimmon Homes Lancashire Limited (508) (<i>RPS Planning</i>)		

Matter 10. Cumbria and North Lancashire

All District Councils in Cumbria and North Lancashire have been invited to attend the session. Under Matter 10A Districts will have the opportunity to raise issues relating to matters discussed earlier in the EIP. They should however ensure that debate is restricted to matters of a strategic nature. They should avoid unnecessary repetition, and to this end it would be useful if they attended relevant earlier sessions in which they have an interest.

Matter 10A: Sub-regional Strategy

- (i) Does the strategy communicate a clear, sustainable and appropriate vision for the sub-region? If not how should the strategy be modified? In particular:
- do the proposals for employment, housing, transport and the environment amount collectively to a coherent and appropriate vision for the sub-region;
 - are the proposals for employment land (of various kinds) appropriate and achievable;
 - are the transport proposals adequate and logical in relation to the strategy as a whole;
 - is adequate attention paid to issues of climate change and the protection of the environment;
 - are there any other material deficiencies, which you perceive in the plan as it affects the sub-region;
 - do you believe the proposals to be deliverable, through the development plan system or in other ways;
 - the extent to which cross-border issues have been considered, especially in relation to Scotland;
 - how will the sub-regional sub-area priorities be monitored.
- (ii) Do the sub-regional policies sufficiently address issues arising from the Energy Review 2006?

Matter 10B: Housing Issues

- (i) Is the sub-region’s housing provision and distribution appropriate and achievable? Are the PDL targets in Table 9.1 realistic, deliverable, and based on robust evidence?

Participants Matter 10

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	North West Regional Development Agency (498)	5	Cumbria County Council (715)
6	Lancashire County Council (538)	7	Lake District National Park Authority (573)
8	Allerdale BC (392)	9	Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council (679)
10	Carlisle City Council (394)	11	Copeland BC (383)
12	Eden DC (532)	13	South Lakeland DC (356)
14	Lancaster City Council (623)	15	Cumbria Tourist Board (365)
16	Forestry Commission (678)	17	National Trust (736)
18	North West Rural Communities Council (474)	19	Cumbria Strategic Partnership (735)
20	North West Planning Aid (385)	21	Kirkby Stephen Town PC (381)/ Upper Eden Community Plan Group (382)
22	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)	23	North West Environmental Link (628)
24	North West Development Consortium (506)/ Paycause Ltd (568) (<i>Barton Willmore</i>)	25	Countryside Properties (Northern Ltd) (528)

Matter 11. Delivery, Monitoring, Implementation and Review

Matter 11A: Delivery

- (i) Could the clarity and consistency of the draft RSS be improved? Is the draft RSS “user friendly” in terms of understanding the strategy and how the policies are to be implemented?
- (ii) Does the draft RSS provide an appropriate level of detail for the preparation of Local Development Documents? Does it provide appropriate guidance for other local plans (e.g. LTPs) and delivery mechanisms? Do the proposals in Chapter 19 of the RSS adequately provide for the transition from Structure Plans to the new LDF system?

Matter 11B: Monitoring

- (iii) Are there sufficient processes in place such as Annual Monitoring Reports, to ensure that the impacts of the RSS can be monitored? Have the right targets and indicators been identified in the Implementation Framework to ensure the RSS can be effectively monitored?
- (iv) Should the draft RSS include a specific policy for monitoring?

Matter 11C: Implementation and Review

- (v) Are there sufficient and appropriate links to delivery agencies and funding mechanisms to ensure delivery?
- (vi) Are the implementation mechanisms appropriate for addressing any cross-border issues that may arise?
- (vii) Is there a need for a focused early review of the RSS? If so what should be the focus and timetable, and what would be the implications for Local Development Documents?
- (viii) When will the research mentioned in paragraph 9.11 on the future requirements for gypsies and travellers be completed and how will this be incorporated into the RSS?

Participants Matter 11

1-2	North West Regional Assembly	3	Government Office for the North West (395)
4	Cheshire County Council (426)	5	Merseyside Policy Unit (536)
6	Cumbria County Council (715)	7	Lancashire CC (538)
8	AGMA (531)	9	Lake District National Park Authority (573)
10	Highways Agency	11	Environment Agency (585)
12	North West Planning Aid (385)	13	Home Builders Federation (515)
14	North West Police Forces (620)	15	Campaign to Protect Rural England (584)
16	North West Development Consortium (506)/ Paycause Ltd (568) (Barton Willmore)		

Programme

WEEK 1	WIGAN INVESTMENT CENTRE
Day 1 Tuesday 31 October 2006 - AM	Introduction by Chris Shepley, Panel Chair Statement by the North West Regional Assembly MATTER 1A: Vision and Objectives
Day1 Tuesday 31 October 2006 - PM	MATTER 1B: Spatial Principles
Day 2 Wednesday 1 November 2006 - AM	MATTER 1C: Assumptions Underpinning the Draft RSS
Day 2 Wednesday 1 November 2006 - PM	MATTER 1D: Overall Approach
Day 3 Thursday 2 November 2006 - AM	MATTER 1E: Sustainability
Day 3 Thursday 2 November 2006 - PM	MATTER 2A: Overall Spatial Strategy
Day 4 Friday 3 November 2006 - AM	MATTER 2A: Overall Spatial Strategy
WEEK 2	WIGAN INVESTMENT CENTRE
Day 5 Tuesday 7 November 2006 - AM	MATTER 2B: City Regions
Day 5 Tuesday 7 November 2006 - PM	MATTER 2C: Locations for Development
Day 6 Wednesday 8 November 2006 - AM	MATTER 2C: Locations for Development
Day 6 Wednesday 8 November 2006 - PM	MATTER 2D: Rural Issues
Day 7 Thursday 9 November 2006 - All Day	MATTER 3A: Economic Development
Day 8 Friday 10 November 2006 - AM	MATTER 3B: Retail

WEEK 3	WIGAN INVESTMENT CENTRE
Tuesday 14 November 2006	NOT SITTING
Day 9 Wednesday 15 November 2006 – All Day	MATTER 4A: Overall Housing Strategy
Day 10 Thursday 16 November 2006 – AM	MATTER 4B: Sustainable Communities
Day 10 Thursday 16 November 2006 – PM	RESERVE SITTING
Friday 17 November 2006 – AM	RESERVE SITTING
WEEK 4	WIGAN INVESTMENT CENTRE
Day 11 Tuesday 9 January 2007 – AM	MATTER 5A: Overall Transport Strategy
Day 11 Tuesday 9 January 2007 – PM	MATTER 5B: Demand Management
Day 12 Wednesday 10 January 2007 – AM	MATTER 5C: Transport Investment & Management Priorities
Day 12 Wednesday 10 January 2007 – PM	MATTER 5D: Airports
Day 13 Thursday 11 January 2007 – AM	MATTER 6A: Environment and Landscape
Day 13 Thursday 11 January 2007 – PM	MATTER 6B: Minerals and Waste
Day 14 Friday 12 January 2007 – AM	MATTER 6B: Minerals and Waste MATTER 3C: Casinos
WEEK 5	WIGAN INVESTMENT CENTRE
Day 15 Tuesday 16 January 2007 – All Day	Manchester City Region & South Cheshire MATTER 7A: Sub-Regional Strategy
Day 16 Wednesday 17 January 2007 – AM	Manchester City Region and South Cheshire MATTER 7B: Housing Issues
Day 16 Wednesday 17 January 2007 – PM	Liverpool City Region MATTER 8A: Sub-Regional Strategy
Day 17 Thursday 18 January 2007 – AM	Liverpool City Region MATTER 8B: Housing Issues
Day 17 Thursday 18 January 2007 – PM	RESERVE SITTING

WEEK 6	LAKE DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK HQ, KENDAL
Day 18 Tuesday 23 January 2007 – All Day	MATTER 6C: Energy CANCELLED
Day 19 Wednesday 24 January 2007 – AM	Central Lancashire City Region MATTER 9A: Sub-Regional Strategy
Day 19 Wednesday 24 January 2007 – PM	Central Lancashire City Region MATTER 9B: Housing Issues
Day 20 Thursday 25 January 2007 – AM	Cumbria and North Lancashire MATTER 10A: Sub-Regional Strategy
Day 20 Thursday 25 January 2007 – PM	Cumbria and North Lancashire MATTER 10B: Housing Issues
Day 21 Friday 26 January 2007 – AM	MATTER 11A-C: Delivery, Monitoring, Implementation and Review
	WIGAN INVESTMENT CENTRE
Day 22 Thursday 15 February 2007 – All day	MATTER 6C: Energy RESCHEDULED

Panel Questions

MATTER 1A: VISION AND OBJECTIVES

TUESDAY 31 OCTOBER 2006 - AM

Preamble

Participants are advised to look at all the questions under Matters 1 and 2. In many cases participants have raised points under a particular sub-matter which may be dealt with elsewhere.

The Panel acknowledge that the general questions about strategy will inevitably raise issues which relate to more specific matters which will be discussed in detail later in the EiP. They are content that Matter 1 will involve some "scene-setting" for later sessions but they wish to avoid detail which is best addressed under other matters.

Parties are requested to address the questions which follow and not simply to repeat what is in their statements, which the Panel have read.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 – "Suggested Wording Changes to draft RSS" produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 "Structure and Broad Content of RSS" produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

1A (i) Are the overall vision and objectives in the draft RSS appropriate and do they adequately cover the characteristics and issues of the whole region?

Panel Questions

Structure

Is the structure and logic of the presentation logical? Is there a reasonable progression from the vision to the general material in Part 1, the objectives in 4.2 (including the RTS Objectives) and the principles and policies which follow? Are the vision and objectives as they stand clear and concise?

Does the GONW structure proposed in Briefing Paper 2 offer a better alternative? How realistic is it to make such a fundamental change at this stage without causing delay?

Should there be a separate Chapter on Climate Change issues, as suggested by Friends of the Earth?

Content of the Vision and Objectives

Does the draft RSS contain inadequate reference to the City Regions, as the Northern Way statement suggests? Or does it pay too much attention to the urban areas and deal inadequately with the rural areas / parts of the region outside the City Regions, as other parties argue? Does it recognise the diversity of the region?

Is the draft RSS sufficiently “outward-looking”? Does it place the region in the context of Europe, the UK and the North as a whole? Does the Strategy suffer from the lack of a National Spatial Planning Framework? (TCPA and others).

Are the vision and objectives sufficiently North West related, or are they largely a restatement of national objectives?

Is the plan sufficiently “spatial” – in the sense that it should go beyond land use and deal with social issues and matters such as health, education etc?

Notwithstanding that the City Regions will be debated under Matter 2B – is there a doubt about the coherence and cohesion of the Central Lancashire City Region, as several parties have suggested?

How far do the revisions suggested by NWRA themselves in paragraph 1.5 of their statement help to answer some of these points?

Several alternative “Visions” have been put forward. Attention is drawn not only to the GONW paper but inter alia to the proposals by AGMA (statement p3), EA (statement p2 and orig. evidence) and CPRE (statement p 2/3 and orig. evidence). Do any of these “visions” represent an improvement on the draft RSS?

Are there any other matters which participants wish to raise here which are not dealt with elsewhere?

1A (ii) Does the draft RSS provide an appropriate, realisable and sustainable strategy for the region, having regard to national objectives/ policy, key strategic issues and factors influencing change?

Preamble

The question of the balance between economic, social and environmental considerations will be considered under Matter 1E. There will also be debate under 1E as to whether the plan deals adequately with social issues such as diversity and equality, the ageing population etc.

Panel Questions

Does the draft RSS generally comply with National Policy, as GONW suggest? Or does it fail to do so – especially, as several parties have suggested, in relation to the UK Sustainability Strategy? What changes should the Panel recommend?

Is there sufficient integration between the housing, employment, transport and other parts of the Strategy? (This will be discussed in more detail under Matter 2A (ii))

Has any work been done which adequately sets out whether resources are available to realise the Strategy?

Does the draft RSS deal adequately with environmental assets - matters such as the natural and historic environment, culture and heritage, National Parks, AONBs etc?

Does the Strategy look ahead far enough?

Are there any other relevant matters which participants wish to raise?

MATTER 1B: SPATIAL PRINCIPLES

TUESDAY 31 OCTOBER 2006 - PM

Preamble

The original Panel questions (i) and (ii) will be taken together. Participants should be ready to comment on the GONW list of "Strategic Principles" on pages 9-13 of GONW Briefing Paper 2 as well as on Policy DP1 and other relevant sections of the draft RSS. Question (iii) on the Sequential Test will be taken sequentially.

1B (i) Does the draft RSS set out the right underlying principles for spatial planning in the region?

1B (ii) Are the different elements of DP1 clearly stated, and how will they be monitored?

Panel Questions

Taking Policy DP1:

Is DP1 sufficiently North West specific or does it merely re-state National Policy?

Is the policy as a whole too "conceptual" or "aspirational"? Does it provide guidance which is applicable and practical in the preparation of LDFs? If not what changes should be made?

Is there confusion over the terms "Plans and Strategies" and "Proposals and Schemes"?

Is the first section clear and understandable? (Several parties have expressed confusion about the wording of parts of this section)

Is the last section on Climate Change adequate? (Note – this will be considered fully under Matter 1E (iii))

Are there other matters which should be included in DP1 such as health, social cohesion and equal opportunities, the protection of the natural and historic environment, etc?

Taking the alternatives:

Does the GONW set of strategic principles deal with all these issues? Is it preferable to Policy DP1 and is it generally supported? Is it North West specific; is it helpful to LDF preparation; does it cover all the matters which need to be covered?

Do parties have any comments on specific parts of the GONW proposal on pp 9-13 of Briefing Paper 2? (The Panel will briefly go through the GONW list to allow comments on each section)

Are there other points in the alternative suggested by Cumbria (statement paragraph ii) and the addition from CPRE (statement paragraph 3) which should be taken into account?

Taking monitoring and implementation:

There will be a further debate in Matter 11 on this topic; but are the general principles put forward in DP1 or in the GONW alternative capable of being adequately monitored? What improvements need to be made either to the policy itself or to Appendix A1 of the Draft Implementation Framework?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

1B (iii) Is the sequential approach in DP1 appropriate?

Panel Questions

Should the policy refer to “sustainable locations first”, rather than “brownfield first”, on the basis that other undeveloped land may sometimes be more suitable for development than previously developed land?

Is there a danger of “town cramming and the loss of urban green space?

Is the reference to the use of existing buildings in bullet point 1, ahead of previously developed land in bullet point 2, acceptable (given Draft PPS3) or appropriate?

Will the concentration on brownfield land mean that insufficient land might come forward for development?

Is the reference to access by public transport, walking and cycling too onerous, especially in rural areas?

Is the policy too general and would the alternative suggested by Friends of the Earth (statement p 2/3) represent a better approach?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

MATTER 1C: ASSUMPTIONS UNDERPINNING THE DRAFT RSS

WEDNESDAY 1 NOVEMBER 2006 – AM

Preamble

In all of the matters to be discussed under Matter 1C, the Panel would remind participants that there will be further discussions later in the EiP. In particular population/housing will be discussed under Matter 4. The constraints under question (iv) will be raised in various places.

The purposes of the session under Matter 1C are firstly to set the scene for these later discussions; and secondly to concentrate on cross-cutting issues. Do the assumptions and forecasts adequately match as between topics? Has the inter-relationship of issues been adequately taken into account? Does the plan as a whole hang together (notwithstanding objections parties may have to particular features of it)?

Some parties have raised in their statements issues which will be considered elsewhere, and participants are asked to seek as far as possible to concentrate on scene-setting and on consistency rather than on the way in which policies might affect particular places.

1C (i) Are the economic assumptions (including growth and activity rates) in draft RSS appropriate and achievable?

Panel Questions

Some parties, notably GONW and AGMA, have criticised the Regeneris scenarios. E.g. they are out of date, use old County areas, etc. Are their criticisms justified? If so what changes should be made?

Is the fact that the sub-regional scenarios have been constrained by a view about the region as a whole appropriate? Does the use of scenarios to give the highest employment figures in each sub-region create unacceptable inconsistencies?

Are the scenarios too “pessimistic” as some parties suggest – to the extent that they might constrain, for example, needed housing development? Or are they unachievable, as others suggest? Is a suggested growth rate of 2.57% pa, given the current rate of 2.09%, realistic?

Is such a level of growth compatible with sustainability objectives? Does it take into account the capacity of the environment? (Again this will be discussed later in the EiP)

Is the strategy sufficiently flexible to cater for changes – upwards or downwards in growth rates?

Is GVA an acceptable measure or should economic, social and environmental benefits be pursued jointly (FoE)? If so how should this be reflected in the strategy?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

1C (ii) Are the assumptions about population change in the draft RSS appropriate?

(Note – the question of more recent forecasts such as the ODPM 2003-based household projections will be discussed under Matter 4)

Panel Questions

Is there evidence (leaving aside for the moment the more recent forecasts) to suggest that a population growth of 2% between 2005 and 2025 is likely to be substantially incorrect?

Is the use of a compromise between the “long term” and “recent success” scenarios appropriate?

Does the methodology, rooted in the economic assumptions, fail adequately to take account of issues such as migration or the changing age structure of the population?

Is there sufficient flexibility in the strategy to respond to different trends?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

1C (iii) Are the economic, population and other assumptions consistent between the regional and sub-regional policies in the draft RSS?

Panel Questions

Are the Assembly correct to argue that it is necessary to adopt a single consistent basis for economic forecasts across the region, or could any of the sub-regional forecasts made by various parties and summarised in Table 3 of NWRA Briefing Paper No 3 reasonably be adopted?

Has there been a sufficient “feedback loop” (GONW) between the economic assumptions and the policy-driven household distribution?

Is it a concern that different scenarios have been used for policies W3 and L4? What, if any, are the implications of such concerns for the strategy?

Are there any inconsistencies (of a general nature and not in relation to specific locations) between the proposals for housing and economic development at a sub-regional level?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

1C (iv) Are the national and regional constraints on development clearly articulated? Are the development proposals consistent with Green Belt, flood risk policies and other constraints such as transport, water supply and sewerage infrastructure?

(Note – Green Belt will be discussed in more detail under Matter 2C and water supply/flood risk etc will be debated under Matter 6)

Panel Questions

Is there sufficient clarity in the way national constraints have been taken into account? Would a series of maps assist?

How far have the distribution of housing growth and the location of Regionally Significant Economic Development taken into account environmental and infrastructure constraints? Where is the evidence base for this?

In particular are the location of major employment sites and other development consistent with transport constraints? Do the transport assessments take into account future developments or are they based on the existing situation?

Does the concentration of development in the City Regions require a particularly high level of investment, and is this likely to be achievable?

The Environment Agency express concern about the capacity of the region to accommodate the level of growth proposed and refer to water resource capacity, waste water treatment and sewerage capacity, flood risk constraints, and waste management and treatment facilities. In general, are these constraints which can be overcome, and can this be achieved in ways which are affordable and which are acceptable in environmental terms?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

MATTER 1D: OVERALL APPROACH

WEDNESDAY 1 NOVEMBER 2006 – PM

1D (i) Does the draft RSS align with the Regional Economic Strategy, the Regional Housing Strategy and Regional Funding Allocation advice?

Preamble

The Panel see this session as a relatively technical debate as to the alignment between the various strategies. For the most part they do not intend it to be a discussion of the merits of policy – these matters will be dealt with elsewhere. The question for example of the roles of Preston, Chester and the other major towns and cities will be discussed under Matter 2C. There will be discussion about the regional employment sites and the housing figures under Matters 3 and 4 and there are a number of points in the parties' statements which might best be considered in those sessions.

Participants' attention is drawn to GONW Briefing Paper no 3 – "RSS/RES/RFA Alignment".

Panel Questions

In general terms the perception of the Panel, based on the representations, is that there is a reasonable degree of alignment between the RSS and the RES, RHS and RFA. There has been close cross-working on all these strategies. There are a number of detailed concerns but not a general feeling that the documents are in serious conflict. Is this perception correct? And if not what are the key differences (excluding those picked up below)?

Is it the case that the draft RSS fails adequately to deal with regeneration priorities, as compared with the RES (See e.g. GONW paper p 4)? Does it give too much emphasis, compared with the RES, to the urban areas/city regions and not enough to the rural areas and smaller communities?

Is it the case, as the EA and the Brethren's Gospel Trusts suggest, that the draft RSS is not aligned with the RES because it is based on maximising growth while the RES takes the line of requiring sustainable economic development?

Without dealing with detailed allocations of housing numbers (which are for later) do the points made by GONW in the bullet point at the

top of p4 of Briefing Paper 3 suggest a serious misalignment between RSS and RHS?

As compared with the RHS, does the draft RSS pay too little attention to affordability or the need to provide for clearance replacement?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

1D (ii) Does the draft RSS properly reflect the Northern Way and other relevant strategies?

Preamble

Once again this session is concerned primarily with conformity rather than content. The question, for example, of whether too much emphasis is given to the City Regions will be debated in more detail under Matter 2B (i).

Panel Questions

The Northern Way Growth Strategy

Some participants (notably FoE, CPRE and Lancs CC) have questioned the status of the NWGS. To what extent should it drive the RSS, and to what extent is this EIP an opportunity to test the NWGS assumptions and policies in public?

Cheshire and Lancashire argue that the Northern Way is “not a panacea” and that the RSS should “not over-rely” on it to provide a strategic context. Others suggest that insufficient account is taken of it and that it should be the basis of the RSS. How much weight should be given to the NWGS?

Is the draft RSS different from what it might have been if the Northern Way did not exist? If so, in what way? Does this include a shift in the fundamental strategy in favour of the City Regions and to the detriment of the peripheral sub-regions? (These questions come from Allerdale’s statement)

Does the draft RSS accurately reflect all of the key aims of the NWGS? Is it the case, as some suggest, that while it takes on board the City Region approach it fails to take account of other factors? (Examples include “priorities to build upon and create new assets in the North” (N Way); the contribution the NW can make to reducing the £30 bn productivity gap (GO and others); “truly sustainable communities” (Brethren’s Gospel Trusts); and – particularly – connectivity between

the region and other regions, especially across the Pennines (several parties)).

Are Paragraphs 3.8 and 3.9 adequate in their summary of the Northern Way?

With regard to the City Region Development Programmes (and other sub-regional plans such as the Lake District Economic Futures Study): to what extent is the RSS/should the RSS be a “top-down” strategy and to what extent “bottom-up”, reflecting the content of these documents? Is the relationship between the CRDPs and Part 4 of the draft RSS sufficiently clear?

Other strategies

What changes need to be made to the draft RSS to reflect the relationship of the North West with Scotland, Wales and surrounding Regions? (Note – there will be a more detailed debate on the West Cheshire/N E Wales Strategy under Matter 8A (ii))

Are there any other strategic documents which are not adequately dealt with in the draft RSS?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

1D (iii) Are the separate objectives of the Regional Transport Strategy appropriate and how do they link to the overall draft RSS objectives, spatial principles and the spatial framework?

Preamble

The key point which many parties have raised concerns the extent to which there should be a single set of objectives – incorporating the RTS objectives within one consolidated list of overall spatial principles.

GONW in Briefing Paper 2 suggest a way in which this might be done, incorporating some RTS objectives in the list of strategic principles discussed earlier, notably on page 11, and suggesting a set of transport objectives, to be incorporated in the thematic chapter, on p 22.

Panel Questions

Should there be a single list of over-arching objectives covering the RSS and RTS as a whole? Does the suggestion from GONW provide a satisfactory way of doing this?

Are there any comments on the GONW objectives in Briefing Paper 3 on page 22 or elsewhere?

Looking at the existing objectives on p 8 of the RSS, NWTAR (statement p 6/7) and CPRE (statement p3) have made a number of detailed comments. Do parties wish to comment on any of these proposed changes?

Is the question of connectivity between the NW and other regions and Nations adequately covered in either set of objectives? Or as the NWTAR (and others) suggest is it wrong to encourage movement between different city regions?

Are there any other relevant matters which the parties wish to raise?

MATTER 1E: SUSTAINABILITY

THURSDAY 2 NOVEMBER 2006 – AM

1E (i) Are the Sustainability Appraisal and the Strategic Environmental Assessment robust?

Preamble

The Panel do not propose to hold a discussion on Matter 1E (i). There have not been substantial concerns expressed about the robustness of the ongoing SA and SEA processes. Many points have however been made about the way in which the draft RSS itself has taken on board the conclusions of the SA report. The Panel consider it best that these points are considered as part of the examination of the draft RSS itself, rather than as a separate debate on the SA report, and look to the parties to raise them during discussion on ensuing items.

The Panel will however allow an opportunity at the end of the discussion on Matter 1E to enable parties to raise any remaining points arising from the SA/SEA.

On the important question of Appropriate Assessment, the Panel are aware that NWRA have concluded that Stage II Appropriate Assessment is necessary but that it has not yet been commenced (See NWRA Briefing Paper No 21a). The Panel requested details of the sites and policies which might be affected, and have very recently been given an indication that 25 policies might affect three (and possibly a further six) European sites. Discussions are ongoing between NWRA and GONW on this matter and NWRA have indicated that they do not at present have the resources to carry out the next stages of the work. It seems clear that it will not be possible for an informed debate to take place on this matter at the EIP. It will be necessary for the GO to deal with this issue during their consideration of the RSS after the Panel has reported. It is unlikely to be possible for the RSS to be adopted until this matter is resolved. The Panel will ask the NWRA and GONW to explain the procedures they intend to follow to ensure that this matter is dealt with.

1E (ii) Does the draft RSS achieve the right balance between economic growth, social inclusion, including equality and diversity issues and environmental protection/ enhancement?

Preamble

The Panel intend to have an open discussion on this question. They are aware, as some have pointed out, that environmental, social and economic principles should not be “traded off” but should be met together. However the question has generated a varied response. Many argue that there is too much emphasis on economic growth. The Panel are concerned that some of the points which are made by the parties are very general and wish to receive specific proposals for change.

Panel Questions

Does the draft RSS achieve the right balance between economic growth, social inclusion, including equality and diversity issues, and environmental protection/enhancement?

Within this debate, the panel wish to hear views inter alia on:

- Whether the strategy is about “sustaining development rather than sustainable development” (Lancs CC);
- Whether the strategy has considered environmental capacity/environmental limits adequately (especially bearing in mind the EA statement);
- Whether the strategy is concerned with a “strong stable and sustainable economy” (UKSDS) or still reflects the earlier aim to “maintain high and stable levels of economic growth”. Does the plan concentrate inappropriately on the quantity of economic development rather than the quality?
- Whether the concentration on City Regions is advantageous in creating a more sustainable pattern of development and in reaching the socially excluded;
- Whether more should be said about equality and diversity (note – NWRA intend to produce a technical paper on this but do not have funding for it), social exclusion, the needs of the elderly, and the need for better community engagement.
- Whether parties agree with the CPRE approach in “What you Measure Matters” and their view that quality of life, which is quite high in the region, is a more useful measure of whether the economy is delivering the benefits needed than economic growth.

In each case the Panel would like to hear specific suggestions as to changes which parties wish to see.

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

1E (iii) Do the proposals in the draft RSS sufficiently provide for tackling climate change and mitigating for its impact?

Preamble

The majority, but not all, respondents have indicated that they do not consider that the Strategy does enough to deal with climate change. Many have suggested targets.

The Panel wish to have a general debate about the principle but particularly wish to hear specific views about changes which they might recommend to deal with any perceived deficiencies. For example parties wishing to see DP1 strengthened or targets established could help the Panel by being precise about the changes they consider necessary. Participants are also asked to consider which actions should be for Government and which are appropriate at regional or local level.

Transport-related issues will be considered further under 1E (iv).

Panel Questions

Does the strategy fail, as a number of parties argue, to deal sufficiently urgently with climate change? Should climate change be the over-riding priority or, as the HBF suggest, would this be the wrong approach given that there are other imperatives?

Is the strategy disproportionately concerned with mitigating the effects of climate change rather than addressing the causes?

Ought there to be targets and milestones for CO2 reduction, as suggested by several parties and by the earlier Panel which considered the Partial Review in 2004? Or other targets in respect of climate change? How should these be worded?

(Note – parties have drawn attention to the draft Yorkshire and Humberside RSS and participants may wish to look at Policy YH2 in that document).

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

1E (iv) Does the draft RSS provide a framework that can meet the aim of reducing the need to travel?

Panel Questions

Should this question refer to the need to travel *by car* or simply the need to travel?

Is it the case that the policies which promote concentration in the City Regions, other urban areas, and Key Service Centres provide a basis for the plan which will reduce the need to travel?

Many parties have singled out the policies in the transport chapter as failing to address climate change. It is argued for example that highway schemes are too strongly favoured. This will be discussed later in the EiP; but what general changes do parties wish to see to the transport policies to reflect climate change issues? Is the concept of a travel hierarchy a useful one which should be incorporated into the strategy?

Is it the case that many draft RSS policies (e.g. on connectivity, the Regional Employment sites, airports) will increase carbon emissions and is this justifiable in the context of the strategy as a whole? Does the strategy fail to address the co-location of housing and employment adequately?

Are there any other relevant matters which the parties wish to raise?

Are there any other matters arising from the SA/SEA which parties wish to raise?

MATTER 2A: OVERALL SPATIAL STRATEGY

THURSDAY 2 NOVEMBER 2006 - PM

FRIDAY 3 NOVEMBER 2006 - AM

Participants are advised to look at all the questions under Matters 1 and 2. In some cases participants have raised points under a particular sub-matter which may be dealt with elsewhere. In some cases participants have raised matters which will be dealt with later in the EIP. Participants are requested to concentrate on the questions under Matter 2. Participants are further asked to concentrate on answering the questions which follow and not repeating what is in their statements, which the Panel have read.

The Panel is aware that there is a close interrelationship between the sub-matters – particularly 2A – 2C. In framing the questions which follow they have tried to be clear about when particular issues will be raised and participants are asked to follow this advice in order to avoid, so far as possible, digression or repetition.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 – “Suggested Word Changes to Draft RSS” produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 – “Structure and Broad Content of RSS” produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

2A (i) Does the draft RSS sufficiently express a spatial strategy that addresses the region’s priorities for growth, regeneration and investment? Does policy RDF1 provide sufficient detail on the spatial priorities for main development locations?
2A (ii) Do the thematic policies and sub-regional policies amount to a consistent and coherent regional strategy?

(Note- Questions 2A (i) and (ii) taken together)

Preamble

The Panel regard this session as being particularly important. They wish to consider in a very open way the overall approach taken by the Assembly. The opening questions are deliberately general and highly strategic and the Panel hope for a debate which leaves aside for the moment questions affecting particular places and looks at the region as a whole. Participants are however asked to be as specific as possible as to the changes which they wish to see.

The attention of participants is drawn especially to GONW briefing papers 2 and 6.

The question of the roles of Preston, Chester, Crewe, Lancaster and Carlisle will be taken under this sub-matter.

Panel Questions

General Questions on strategy

Does the strategy, which involves concentration on the three City Regions, disadvantage the remainder of the region? Are areas such as Cumbria/N Lancashire and South Cheshire disadvantaged or is there justification for the concentration on the City Regions? Indeed should there be greater emphasis on them as some (e.g. Northern Way) suggest? Or ought there to be a “more balanced, polycentric ...strategy” (NWDC/ Paycause).

Is the strategy too ambitious; is it trying to be all things to all people? Is it really possible to do everything; to direct development to the City Regions whilst also looking after the regeneration areas outside the City Regions, and the rural areas? If not is there sufficient indication of priority?

Is it the case that, as the HBF suggested under Matter 1D, that RSS should “...avoid focusing on reducing sub-regional disparities, which may in fact increase the north-south wealth gap”?

Is it right to concentrate development in areas of opportunity or would it be better to concentrate on areas of greatest need? Conversely, does the strategy fail to take full advantage of major assets? If there is concentration on the areas of growth and opportunity, exactly how can it be ensured that the benefits derived are spread to areas of need (C Lancs City Auths)?

The City Regions cover about half the region. Is there sufficient prioritisation within them? Ought there for example to be more emphasis on the two main regional centres as engines of growth, and on the inner areas around them, as areas of opportunity?

Policy RDF1

GONW have provided an alternative Regional Spatial Framework (pages 13-15 of Briefing note 2). Does this provide a better approach than RDF1?

(The Panel propose to go through this proposed strategy point by point to allow for comment)

The GO alternative omits bullet points 4 and 5 of RDF1 – should these be re-inserted? Is the Spatial Framework sufficiently “spatial”? (Cheshire suggest a number of areas which should be covered including health, education, crime, leisure, biodiversity etc). Should “the protection and enhancement of the built and natural environment” be added (CPRE).

Is the way in which the GONW proposal deals with Preston, Chester, Crewe, Lancaster and Carlisle appropriate? Is it right that Preston should be seen as the third centre after Manchester and Liverpool but ahead of the others?

RSS Part 4: The sub-regions

Should Part 4 of the strategy be deleted and the policies incorporated into the main thematic chapters as GONW and others suggest? Are there inconsistencies between the thematic chapters and the sub-regional chapters? If so which of them is significant?

Are there any other relevant matters which the parties wish to raise?

2A (iii) Does the spatial strategy provide a framework for improving accessibility to jobs and services particularly by sustainable modes for all parts of the region?

Preamble

There have been relatively few comments on this question and the Panel do not intend to have a substantial debate upon it.

Some important points have been made but many of these fall under other headings:

- Transport (Matter 5);
- Housing;(Matter4);
- Key Service Centres (Matter 2C (i));
- Rural areas (Matter 2D)

Panel Question

Do the parties have any significant points of a strategic nature to make which will not be covered elsewhere in the EiP?

2A (iv) Is it appropriate for the draft RSS to omit the previous designation of Regeneration Priority Areas?

Preamble

Almost all of those who have commented on this question have said that they think the RPA's were helpful and should be included in some form in the Strategy. GONW in Briefing Paper 2 have included a form of words at (c) on page 14.

Panel Questions

Is it the case, as respondents such as Allerdale suggest, that the omission of RPAs implies a downgrading of those areas, which have severe problems, and that it may make the attraction of investment and the implementation of transformational change more difficult?

If it were agreed that the concept of Regeneration Priority Areas should be re-instated, does the GONW proposal meet the point? Which are the areas that should be included, bearing in mind that in the RES the areas identified are East Lancashire, Blackpool, Barrow and West Cumbria?

2A (v) Is the key diagram fit for purpose and do the sub-regional diagrams add value?

Panel Questions

Is the key diagram fit for purpose; is it "confusing and difficult to understand" (NWDC/Paycause); does it reasonably express the over-arching strategy?

In the statements the Panel have received the following suggestions for changes to the key diagram:

-Add: Priority places for growth and development outside the City Regions, Regional Public Transport interchanges and corridors, Broad locations for regional parks, renewable energy, and waste management facilities, Regeneration Priority Areas, The relationship between West Cheshire and North East Wales, The area of overlap between the Manchester and Liverpool City Regions, more environmental factors (World Heritage Sites, Ramsar sites, Green infrastructure, Green Belts, Highland and Lowland areas), and Flood Plains

-Omit: Key Service Centres (some or all)

-Change or clarify: the depiction of the knowledge nuclei and reserve sites (too similar), the notation for Preston, the east-west flows in Lancashire are over-stated, the two-tone representation of the City Regions is confusing.

Which of these should be taken forward?

There are differences of view regarding the value of the sub-regional plans, with rather more respondents supporting them than opposing them. Some have made detailed points, which are for matters 7-10. But in general should the sub-regional plans be retained?

Are there any other relevant matters which the parties wish to raise?

MATTER 2B: CITY REGIONS

TUESDAY 7 NOVEMBER 2006 – AM

2B (i) Does the City Region approach adequately address the different pressures and needs of the various parts of the region or are there alternative sub-regional approaches, which better reflect these needs and pressures?

Should there be greater clarity about:

- a) The geographic extent of the three city regions;**
- b) The broad scale of development they should accommodate; and**
- c) Their role in relation to each other and to towns beyond the city regions such as Carlisle and Crewe?**

Preamble

The Panel are conscious that some of the issues which parties have raised in their evidence and statements on this matter will already have been covered, at least to some extent, in earlier discussions – especially on Matter 2A (i). Participants will have discussed the relative positions of the city regions and the other parts of the north west, and also the roles of Carlisle and Crewe. The debate on this matter will therefore be tailored to some degree to account for the earlier debates.

The attention of participants is drawn to GONW Briefing Paper no 1 and NWRA briefing Paper 6.

Panel Questions

Some parties, such as the CPRE, question the purpose of the City Regions, and suggest that it is not self evident that there needs to be a sub-regional tier. In the light of earlier discussions, what is the value of the sub-regions? Are the City Regions the right choice? What is their rationale, beyond the emphasis upon them in the Northern Way?

What if anything can/should be done about the variety and inconsistency of sub-areas used in the Strategy (City Regions, old Counties, sub-regions, sub-areas, etc)?

Is the GO distinction, broadly between potentially fuzzy and overlapping areas for analysis and more defined areas based on administrative boundaries for policy, a sensible one? Does the Strategy achieve this and if not, how might it be modified to do so?

Without such a distinction, and without anticipating Matter 11 too far, how are policies at City Regional level to be implemented and monitored? There are no administrative units covering the whole of any of the city regions. Will joint working and co-operation – as in the CRDPs - achieve the aims of the strategy at the City Region level as defined?

There are concerns about the boundaries of the City Regions, especially in Cheshire. Is there a different approach for Cheshire, as suggested by the County Council, which would be preferable? (NWRA suggest that there is "...some potential for modification..." – what should this modification comprise?)

In terms of the presently proposed City Regions what is the position of Congleton – the BC prefer the southern part of the District clearly to fall within the Manchester sub-region? What is the position of Vale Royal in relation to the Liverpool City Region, about which the MPU are concerned? And should parts of West Lancashire fall within the Central Lancashire CR rather than Liverpool CR?

A number of parties have raised the West Cheshire/N E Wales strategy. This will be discussed later in the EIP but parties may have views as to how it affects the City Regional approach.

Is there any more to be said, following the earlier debate, about Carlisle and Crewe?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

2B (ii) Are the City Regions to be treated as being equal or is there a hierarchy?

Panel Questions

In the statements on this question there is much use of the word "complementary" (and in one case "complimentary") to describe the roles of the City Regions. While it is recognised that there are differences between them – for example the RDA describe the leading role of Manchester, the smaller but growing position of Merseyside, and

the way in which Central Lancashire “operates at a different scale” – there are relatively few calls for the three to be treated as a hierarchy. However the MPU make a case for a “bi-polar” approach which recognises the dominance of the two core City Regions, believing that that is most likely to achieve the vision of the RSS and the Northern Way. Some other parties have shed doubt on the coherence of the Central Lancashire City Region and this was raised under Matter 1. Is there a case for regarding the CLCR differently from the other two? What would be the practical effect of so doing?

MATTER 2C: LOCATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

TUESDAY 7 NOVEMBER 2006 – PM

WEDNESDAY 8 NOVEMBER 2006 – AM

2C (i) Is the evidence base for Table 7.1 sound? Should the proposed settlement hierarchy be reassessed, and should a consistent approach be adopted toward the identification of Key Service Centres?

Preamble

It appears to the panel that Table 7.1 and the supporting text are in a state of evolution and it is not argued even by the Assembly that it represents the finished article.

NWRA briefing paper 14 summarises the work of Land Use Consultants on this matter. The Assembly do not recommend that the output of this work can or should be incorporated into the strategy at this stage – they see it feeding into a future review – though they do suggest some changes on pages 5 and 6 of their note. Various parties have expressed objection to various points within the LUC paper but others have supported it.

Most parties have criticised the inconsistencies within the present Table 7.1, and many have pointed to the differences in the way the issue is tackled in the urban and rural areas.

Some parties wish to see the table omitted and replaced by a different approach; others wish to see it retained.

Panel Questions

What is the purpose of Table 7.1? Northern Way question its rationale, and ask how it helps to explain and justify priorities. But MPU point to various policies which are directly related to it. In the light of this, how

important is the existence of some kind of hierarchy to the overall strategy?

Need there be an explicit hierarchy as in Table 7.1? Or would it be best as GONW and others suggest doing away with the table and replacing it with a set of criteria which can be used to identify centres via the LDF process? Would this lead to further inconsistencies as between the definitions in different parts of the Region?

If there were to be a criterion based policy – what should the criteria be? Would, for example, the list provided by Cumbria in their statement provide a basis for it? Are the LUC criteria helpful? The Panel would welcome specific guidance on this point from the advocates of criteria.

Is it the case, as some suggest, that Cumbria, and particularly the LDNP, are so different in character from the rest of the region that different criteria should apply?

Is there in any event such a different set of circumstances as between the urban and rural parts of the region that a different approach is required? Would a suitable solution be – as NWRA suggest – to retain the list broadly as it is but to add a policy or background text as to the way the hierarchy should operate within urban areas?

If so, what exactly ought any statement about the urban areas to comprise?

Should the KSCs in Table 7.1 (final columns) be re-named as “KSCs in rural areas”, as some suggest.

Does there need to be a policy relating to more local centres, as NWRA suggest? If so what should it say? (This matter will also be discussed under Matter 2D)

Is it agreed that the LUC work cannot be adequately incorporated into the strategy at this stage or are there elements of it which could be included?

In briefing paper 20a, NWRA propose to omit the last paragraph in policy RDF2; is this supported?

Specifics

A number of points are made about the specifics of the table as it stands; there may be others but the Panel have noted:

- It is argued that Preston should be elevated to the “Regional Centres” category alongside Manchester and Liverpool. Elsewhere it is argued

that an intermediate level between the regional centres and the Regional Towns and Cities, should be incorporated and that it should include Preston Chester and Carlisle (and perhaps others). In the light of earlier discussion, is either of these changes appropriate?

- It is suggested that Kendal and Lytham St Annes might be elevated to the regional towns and cities category and that Skelmersdale might be “relegated” to the KSC category. Are any of these proposals right?

- It is suggested that Sandbach and Alsager should fall within the Manchester City Region and that Northwich and Frodsham should fall within both Manchester and Liverpool City Regions. Are these points accepted?

- Several parties have raise questions of definition – in particular whether the Manchester/Salford and Liverpool regional centres include, or should include, parts of the surrounding inner areas. What is the correct definition in this context?

Are there any other relevant matters which the parties wish to raise?

2C (ii) When, and in what circumstances will there be a need for a review of the Green Belt?

Panel Questions

There have been many comments about the *timing* of possible future reviews of the Green Belts. Some parties suggest that because reviews take some time to complete and implement they should commence earlier than proposed. This perhaps applies more particularly, according to respondents, in Merseyside and Chester. Others suggest that reviews may not be needed – for example in some parts of Cheshire – until later than the draft RSS suggests. There are comments about the later date proposed for Warrington, though the Council support the timing. Should the Panel recommend any changes to the timings suggested?

GONW comment that there is “insufficient clarity between “exceptional substantial strategic change” and “exceptional small scale detailed boundary changes”...” They consider that the boundary changes mentioned in paragraph 7.21 could be described as “substantial” and “strategic”. They recommend the omission of the last sentence of RDF5 and of paragraph 7.21, and the omission of “substantial”. Would these changes clarify the meaning of the policy, which others have also questioned? Are there other changes which parties would suggest to the Panel which would deal with this ambiguity?

What would be the implications of this for the possible changes mentioned in paragraph 7.21? Parties have raised various specific emerging proposals. There will be discussion later in the EiP about the strategic employment sites and the airports. But does Green Belt policy need to reflect emerging proposals for employment sites in East Lancashire, S Ribble/Preston, or near Chester, or proposals at Manchester or Liverpool John Lennon Airports, in any specific way? Or can/should these proposals be taken forward through the LDF process?

Are there any other relevant matters which parties wish to raise?

MATTER 2D: RURAL ISSUES

WEDNESDAY 8 NOVEMBER 2006 – PM

2D (i) Are rural issues, including the development needs of small towns, adequately addressed in the draft RSS?

Preamble

Many helpful points have been made in the representations on this topic. Some of them are, however, in the nature of general exhortations to pay more attention to rural issues, or references to particular topics which parties feel should be covered more fully. The Panel would ask parties to be specific about the changes which they wish to see in these cases. Some points may go beyond what is possible or desirable for an RSS to cover, and some tend to repeat what is already in national policy; the Panel would ask the parties to bear these points in mind too.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

Panel Questions

A number of parties suggest that rural issues are not well covered in the draft RSS. The scale, diversity, economic importance, inter-relationships and problems of those areas are not fully recognised. What specific changes do parties wish to see to redress this perceived imbalance?

GO and others propose that the Strategy should pay specific regard to the Regional Rural Development Framework and that its six headline priorities should be incorporated into policy RDF3. Would this be a valuable addition and help to address the question above?

CPRE in their statement (p 2/3) suggest an extensive list of additions. Would these address the point in the questions above? Are parties happy with all of the points in the CPRE suggestion? (TAR also suggest a new bullet point about tranquillity, landscape etc)

Many of the parties' comments are about the role of key service centres. Many argue that there should be a policy regarding local centres too, and in briefing note 20a the NWRA have put forward a suggestion as to the ground which such a policy might cover. Does this provide a useful way forward and to what extent does it meet the comments of respondents?

Cumbria have also put forward a form of words, covering similar ground and taken from the JSP: "*Small scale development to help sustain local services, meet local needs, or support rural businesses will be permitted in towns and villages defined as local service centres in Local Development Frameworks. It will be the exception for new development to be located in the open countryside*". Does this offer a way forward for the region as a whole?

Some parties have called for a more flexible approach outside centres – especially in relation to the growth of rural businesses and the conversion of redundant farm buildings to various uses. The RDA have pointed out that the expansion of businesses may not always enhance the rural environment. Is more flexibility required here?

In respect of the sparse rural areas, and especially the Lake District, several parties suggest that the policies – even with the addition of reference to local centres, fail to respond to the particular needs of those areas. Does the Strategy need to provide greater flexibility, to the LDNP in particular, to provide services in a different way, or does the last part of RDF3 adequately recognise this point?

Cumbria Assoc of Local Councils question whether planning has sufficient "reach" to ensure that KSCs and Local Centres provide an adequate range of services, citing health as an example. Is this a problem for the Strategy?

Are there any other relevant matters which the parties wish to raise?

MATTER 3A: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

THURSDAY 9 NOVEMBER 2006

Preamble

Discussion will focus first on the general employment land provisions reflected in Policy W3 and Tables 8.2 and 8.3 of the RSS. Subsequently we will turn to the broad locations for regionally significant economic development set out in Policy W2 and Table 8.1. Although some of the broad locations listed in Table 8.1 have been linked to specific development proposals, the present examination is concerned with the general strategy contained in the draft RSS, rather than the detailed merits or consequences of particular schemes.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

3A (i) Is there a sound evidence base for the employment land provisions set out in Tables 8.2 and 8.3?

Panel Questions

Table 8.2 quantifies the need for additional employment land. It compares the current supply of committed employment land (excluding strategic regional sites) with the projected future requirement based on recent take-up rates (adjusted to reflect an assumed increase in economic activity, and further adjusted to provide additional flexibility). As the recent take-up rates include development on strategic regional sites, they appear to represent the sum of all employment land development in the region, not just development of sub-regional or local importance. In view of this, should committed land within strategic regional sites be included in Row A? And should Row H then be taken to show the total regional requirement for employment land?

The projected take up rates in Table 8.2 are based on different economic scenarios, according to which offers the highest employment level for a particular sub-region. Is this approach flawed?

Table 8.2 assumes that future increases in GVA will be reflected in an increased take-up of employment land, at a ratio of 1:05. The basis for this assumption is not clear. Is it supported by any empirical evidence?

The land supply for Cheshire in Table 8.2 includes large sites at Ince Marshes and Stanlow, which are subject to special constraints. Should these be excluded?

Is it appropriate to assess future land requirements on the basis of past take up rates? AGMA argue for an alternative approach based on job growth targets and assumed increases in GVA. This appears to give a similar result to that shown in Table 8.3, in which increases in the land requirement for development in Use Classes B1 and B8 are more than offset by the falling demand for industrial land in Use Class B2. Does this provide a more appropriate basis for the RSS?

How does Table 8.3 relate to Table 8.2, and how is it to be applied? Policy W3 indicates that it should provide the basis of an appropriate balance between B1, B2 and B8 uses, but the mechanics of this need further explanation. Should Table 8.3 be deleted as suggested by NWDA?

Policy W3 requires the establishment of a portfolio of sites, at least 30% of which should be “available”. How is this to be accomplished in practice?

Does Policy W3 adopt a “predict and provide” approach to the supply of land for economic development? What form might a “plan, monitor and manage” approach take?

3A (ii) Should the draft RSS set out employment land provision at a district level as well as the sub-regional level?

Panel Questions

NWRA Briefing Paper No 7 suggests ways in which employment land requirements could be apportioned between districts, but outlines the disadvantages of each. Should guidance at the district level be provided, and if so how?

The Implementation Framework indicates that local authorities will have to work together to provide the land requirements set out in Policies W2 and W3. What is the machinery for this? How are partnerships between local authorities intended to operate and how will disputes be resolved?

Should each local planning authority make its own assessment of employment land requirements within its area, being guided rather than be constrained by Table 8.2?

3A (iii) On what basis have the broad locations for regionally significant economic development in Table 8.1 been selected and are the locations sustainable? Do they reflect the regional spatial framework and sub-regional policy framework in the draft RSS? How do they reflect and reinforce the spatial distribution of economic growth, regeneration priorities, and the broad housing locations, and what are the transport implications? (Note – for the avoidance of doubt the Parkside Colliery proposal falls within this policy)

Panel Questions

General Principles

Is the definition of regionally significant economic development in paragraph 8.6 of the draft RSS adequate? Should there be criteria for site selection, for instance reflecting those in Policy EC5 of RPG13?

Should the criteria in Appendix RT5.1 apply to all proposed Inter Modal Freight Terminals?

Is there any evidence that a lack of sites for regionally significant economic development is restricting the increase of GVA in the North West? The number of locations for regionally significant economic development has grown from 11 in RPG13 to 25 in the RES – on what basis? Is there any limit to the number of sites or the amount of land required?

On what criteria have the broad locations in Table 8.1 been selected in preference to possible alternatives? Alternatives suggested in representations include Barrow, Penrith, Kendal, Samesbury, Fleetwood-Thornton, M55 Junction 4, Atlantic Gateway, Approach 580, Seaforth, St Helens SIA, Wirral Waters, Widnes Waterfront EDZ, Ellesmere Port, Cutacre, Holmes Chapel, Alderley Edge, Ashton Moss and Wavertree. Would any of these fall within the broad locations identified in draft RSS? Have they been considered for inclusion?

Does Policy W2 allow sufficient scope for identifying new locations for significant economic development?

In selecting broad locations, what account has been taken of accessibility and commuting; the potential contribution to regeneration and employment need; the broad housing locations proposed in RSS; flood risk; Green Belt policy; and other constraints? Should the RSS establish criteria for the identification of sites for regional significant employment development to take account of these factors?

A number of the broad locations proposed in Table 8.1 include Strategic Regional Sites identified in the RES, which are under construction, are the subject of planning permission, or are allocated in the relevant development plan. Should these be shown as specific commitments rather than as broad locations, particularly as the number of sites in each broad location is usually to be limited to one?

Why is there a limit of one site in each broad location?

Particular Locations

South West of Chester (proposed for a reserve knowledge nucleus site and aligned with Chester Business Park Regional Strategic site in RES). Cheshire CC say that Chester does not have strong links to the region's higher educational or research and development institutions. Why is it an appropriate location for a knowledge nucleus site? The Chester City Council's evidence is that Chester's economy is at full capacity, with unemployment of 1.7%. Housing is expensive and in short supply. The city is surrounded by Green Belt which helps preserve its setting and special character. The proposed broad location for development appears to be within an area of high flood risk. NWRA's consultants found that the Chester Business Park scored very poorly in terms of sustainability? In view of these considerations, what is the justification for Chester as a location for further regionally significant economic development?

South of Crewe. Does the Basford site have potential as an Inter-modal Freight Terminal?

South West Greater Manchester and Newton-le-Willows (proposed for IMFTs and aligned respectively with the Carrington and Parkside Colliery Strategic Regional Sites in RES). Development in either of these locations would appear to encroach into the Green Belt. Has any assessment been made of the number, size and optimum location of IMFTs in the North West, including the availability of road and rail capacity to serve them? Alternatives are being promoted at Ditton (Widnes), Barton (shown as being within a broad location for a Regional Investment Site), Birkenhead Waterfront, and possibly Basford. Can further IMFTs be justified within the Green Belt?

Central Carlisle (proposed as a Knowledge Nucleus Site). How would this be linked to higher education institutions, research and development facilities, existing knowledge based industries or major hospitals? Further explanation of the suitability of this location for a Knowledge Nucleus Site is required.

3A (iv) Are the land designations in W2 focused enough in terms of use, or will they allow for significant B1 office development, which could undermine more sustainable town/city centre locations?

Panel Question

Policy W2 indicates that headquarter functions could be accommodated on Knowledge Nucleus Sites. Knowledge based activity may itself contain substantial elements of office development. Is Policy W2 contrary to the sequential approach to office development outlined in PPS6? Are the broad locations specified suitable for office development? Does the policy require clarification on office development, along the same lines as Policy W3?

3A (v) Is there sufficient clarity regarding the types and scale of development, which will be permitted on reserve sites? Do current trends in inward investment support the retention of reserve sites for “large scale manufacturing”?

Panel Questions

Are reserve sites to be fully serviced, but then held back indefinitely until an appropriate user is identified? How is this to be accomplished, once planning permission has been granted? Who is to decide when “investment would otherwise be lost to the region” and on what basis?

Are there any other matters which participants wish to raise here which are not dealt with elsewhere?

MATTER 3B: RETAIL

FRIDAY 10 NOVEMBER 2006 - AM

Preamble

Discussion will focus on Policy W5 and Table 8.4 of the draft Regional Spatial Strategy.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

3B (i) Have the appropriate centres been listed in policy W5?***Panel Questions***

Should the regional towns and cities listed in Table 7.1 be given priority as focal points for retail development? At present Ellesmere Port, Widnes, Runcorn (Halton Lea) and Skelmersdale are excluded from the list in Policy W5. Of these Widnes has more than 28,000 sq m of comparison retail floorspace, and is of a comparable size to some of the centres listed. Ellesmere Port, Runcorn and Skelmersdale are smaller, but Policy W5 does not preclude development that would enhance their vitality and viability. Should comparison retail development be explicitly encouraged in these centres?

Kendal is not listed as a regional town in Table 7.1, but is listed in Policy W5 as a centre in which additional retail development is to be encouraged. Is this a consistent approach?

Only 3 centres in Cumbria are listed in Policy W5 (Carlisle, Barrow and Kendal). Additional centres that have been proposed by objectors include Workington, Whitehaven, Penrith, Maryport, Ulverston, Wigton and Keswick. These are each notably smaller than the centres listed, but serve populations who must travel considerable distances to the listed centres. Is there a case for promoting one or more additional centres in Cumbria?

Are there other centres that merit inclusion on the list in Policy W5?

3B (ii) Should a more hierarchical approach be adopted in Policy W5?***Panel Question***

Policy W5 proposes a 3-level hierarchy of centres in which Manchester and Liverpool City Centres constitute the top tier, a network of 24 listed centres form the second tier, and unidentified centres form the third tier. It has been argued that Chester, Preston and Carlisle should be promoted to an intermediate level between the first and second tiers, in view of their particular sub-regional importance. Chester and Preston each have a comparison retail floor area of more than 90,000 sq m, and appear to be the biggest of the listed second tier centres. Carlisle is smaller, but undoubtedly serves an extensive catchment. The RES highlights the emerging importance of Preston as a growth centre, and also gives priority to growth opportunities in Chester and Carlisle. On the other hand, the concentration of retail investment in a limited number of centres may encourage shoppers to make longer trips than would be the case with a more even distribution.

3B (iii) Is the floor space requirement shown in Table 8.4 realistic?***Panel Questions***

Table 8.4 sets out indicative comparison floorspace requirements, which are to provide a benchmark to inform Local Development Frameworks. The aggregate comparison retail floor area of the centres specified in Policy W5 is about 1.6 million sq m. The aggregate additional indicative requirement is for more than 2.2 million sq m - i.e. about 140% of the present floor area of the specified centres. By comparison, expenditure on comparison goods is expected to grow by 83% over the plan period (Technical Appendix paragraph 3.191). Some of this growth is likely to be absorbed by special forms of trading and increased efficiency. The indicative requirement is not apportioned between local planning authorities, who will have to make their own assessments of need. Is Table 8.4 of value as a basis for their work?

Are there any other retail matters that participants wish to raise, which have not been covered?

MATTER 3C: CASINOS

FRIDAY 12 JANUARY 2007 - AM

Preamble

The time allocated to this matter is limited. Participants are asked therefore to avoid repeating what is in their statements; the Panel have read them. The Panel are looking to parties to respond to the statements of others, where necessary, and to concentrate on the questions which follow.

NWRA in Briefing Paper 20, have suggested a change to para 8.33 of the Draft RSS.

Panel Questions**3C (i) Is the approach to casinos in Policy W8 of the draft RSS appropriate?**

- 1 Is it appropriate for the RSS to indicate a preference for a broad location for a regional casino? How does this relate to the work of the Casino Advisory Panel?

- 2 If a preference is expressed, is there sufficient justification for the choice of Blackpool?
 - 3 If Blackpool were to remain as the choice, should changes be made to Policy W8 or to paras 8.33-34, for example along the lines suggested by GONW? If 8.33 remains in the RSS, how is viability to be measured?
 - 4 Should any changes be made to paras 8.37 or 8.38, for example to reflect the points made by Blackpool Council (paras 3.9-10) or the North West Police Forces?
-

MATTER 4A: OVERALL HOUSING STRATEGY

WEDNESDAY 15 NOVEMBER 2006

Preamble

Discussion will focus first on the evidence underpinning the draft RSS housing proposals, and the extent to which those proposals reflect economic growth and regeneration priorities and are consistent with environmental limits. We will then consider the question of affordable housing, housing markets and emerging national guidance, before discussing the details of implementation, phasing and monitoring.

Although today's session will cover the general principles governing the proposed distribution of residential development, we will give more detailed consideration to the numbers of additional dwellings proposed in each district during the sub-regional sessions after Christmas.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 – "Suggested Wording Changes to Draft RSS" produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 – "Structure and Broad Content" produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

4A (i) Is the methodology and evidence base underpinning the scale and distribution of housing in policy L4 sound? Does the amount and distribution of housing reflect and reinforce proposals for the spatial distribution of economic growth and regeneration priorities (including HMRA's)? Does the distribution of housing reflect the draft RSS's regional and sub-regional spatial framework?

Panel Questions

Soundness of evidence base for the proposed regional housing provision

Why was a transformational improvement economic growth scenario not adopted as a basis for the draft RSS housing requirement as sought by NWDA? At the medium economic activity rate assumed, this would require a net increase of up to 29,000 dwellings pa. Alternatively, why was the recent economic performance scenario not adopted, leading to a requirement of c25,500 dwellings pa?

Do the economic growth scenarios and assumed economic activity rates provide an appropriate basis for assessing future housing needs?

Does the proposed housing provision require adjustment in the light of the ODPM 2003-based household projections? If so, what adjustments should be made?

Should the gross housing requirement be specified?

How reliable is the land supply information underpinning the proposals, particularly having regard to the data on urban potential, allocations in existing development plans, and outstanding planning permissions? How have gaps in the land supply information been addressed?

What account was taken of water supply, sewage treatment capacity, flood risk, increased energy consumption and other environmental limits, in deciding on the proposed regional housing requirement and distribution? Should the proposed housing provision be reduced for precautionary reasons?

What is the basis of the indicative targets for “brownfield” development? Do these reflect urban land capacity studies? Are the increases from the levels proposed in Policy UR4 of RPG13 realistic? Will the indicative targets be interpreted as minimum requirements?

Does the draft RSS pay sufficient attention to the quality of the housing stock, both existing and proposed? How might this be improved?

Should specific provision be made for single-bedroom apartments, sheltered housing and extra care housing?

Distribution of the proposed housing

What objective criteria determined the proposed distribution of housing between LPAs?

How does this distribution assist urban regeneration, rural renaissance or sustainable development objectives?

Will there be sufficient land to sustain the net completions proposed in **Manchester, Salford and Liverpool**, particular in view of likely clearance? Can the numbers proposed be delivered in the short term? How would they affect HMRA's? What density of development is implied? Is this consistent with securing mixed sustainable communities? Will there be sufficient demand for this amount of housing? What additional infrastructure will be needed to support the proposed residential development, and can it be provided? Are the proposed numbers excessive?

Are the proposals for **Oldham and Rochdale** deliverable? How would they affect Housing Market Renewal Areas? How would they support economic growth, as the proposed provision falls below the requirement as calculated from the long-term economic growth scenario?

Why is restraint proposed in **Southern Manchester, North East Cheshire, South Cheshire, Wirral, Warrington, Wigan, Bolton, South West Lancashire and the Fylde Peninsula**? The economic scenarios and the ODPM 2003-based projections all point to a need for substantial provision in these areas in addition to that proposed. What are the implications of continued restraint for economic development, the affordability of housing, and commuting patterns?

Is there a case for additional provision in **Preston/South Ribble/Chorley** area, as some objectors argue?

Is the figure for **Burnley** too low, as suggested by Lancashire CC? Does this reflect HMRA activity – i.e. would additional supply exacerbate existing market weakness?

Do the housing requirements for **Crewe, Chester, Warrington, Lancaster and Carlisle** adequately reflect the growth aspirations for these towns in the RES?

Should RSS specify a housing target for the **Lake District National Park**? If so, should it specify that provision should be exclusively for affordable local-need housing?

Is there a case for increased provision in **Sefton, South Lakeland and Eden**?

4A (v) Do the housing policies reflect emerging national guidance? Will they help to provide affordable housing and achieve balanced housing markets?

Panel Questions

Affordable Housing

How could the RSS further stimulate the provision of affordable housing? Should it include affordable housing targets (as draft PPS3 paragraph 5(g))? Or should this be left to local authorities? On what evidence would targets be based? Shelter argue for 50% of all new dwellings, as in London; CPRE argue for 30% to 60% according to need.

Should there be a separate target for social rented housing? Given the recent performance of registered social landlords and local authorities in providing new housing [Technical Appendix Table 4.8] what prospect is there of additional social rented housing making a significant contribution to meeting affordable housing need? What (if anything) should be done to address this issue?

Policy L5 speculates about the areas with the greatest need for affordable housing. Is this appropriate, and on what evidence is it based?

Should Policy L5 have greater regard to the commercial viability of providing affordable housing on particular sites?

Should the reservation of sites for 100% affordable housing be confined to rural areas?

Would developments containing 100% affordable housing be consistent with the objective of establishing mixed communities?

What is the case for imposing local occupancy restrictions on new housing?

Why should the promotion of on-site affordable housing (or developer contributions in lieu of this) be confined to small rural settlements, as in Bullet 5 of Policy L5?

Emerging National Guidance

Different approaches to the definition of Housing Market Areas have been adopted by Ecotec and the local authorities in Cumbria. Policy L2 requires local authorities to make sub-regional housing market assessments. Is it possible to devise a consistent regional approach? What happens if HMAs cut across local authority boundaries and there is no agreement as to their extent? Should the RSS give clearer guidance?

Should RSS define HMAs? Would it be practicable to recast Table 9.1 on the basis of the Housing Market Areas suggested by Ecotec?

Should the RSS include a density target or targets [as draft PPS3 paragraph 5(f)]?

Is the proposed supply and distribution of new housing sufficiently responsive to market demand in accordance draft PPS3, paragraph 9?

4A (ii) Does the draft RSS need to be more flexible in terms of the housing provision to ensure it can respond to changes over the Plan period?

4A (iii) Is the use of maximum targets (net of clearance replacement) for housing completions appropriate in all areas, or is there a need for flexibility to enable planning permissions or completions to be used as a basis to measure the annualised housing requirement against targets?

4A (iv) Should the draft RSS include indicative phasing of the housing figures set out in Table 9.1?

Panel Questions

Flexibility, Phasing and Monitoring

Why are the proposed housing figures expressed as “maxima” in Policy L4 but as “targets” in paragraph 9.22? What is intended? Would “maxima” be unduly prescriptive, impose an unnecessary constraint on supply and encourage under-provision in land release? Should the word “requirements” or “provision” be used in preference to “maxima” or “targets”?

Should figures refer to planning permissions or completions?

Although paragraph 9.20 indicates that the annual figures in table 9.1 are averages, which may be overshoot in some years and missed in others, should this be made explicit in Policy L4? Should performance fall within a range of tolerance on either side of the specified annual figures?

Although Policy L4 provides for LPAs to introduce phasing policies, should phasing be incorporated in the RSS? On what evidence would this be based? Can developers adjust immediately to the higher figures or is a transitional period required?

Is clearer guidance needed regarding net and gross housing provision?

Would it be feasible for the RSS to propose housing provision over a 20-year period, up to 2026?

How will performance be monitored, and how would significant deviations from the proposed average annual provision be addressed?

What arrangements are proposed for the review of Policy L4?

Are there any other matters which participants wish to raise here which are not dealt with elsewhere?

MATTER 4B: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

THURSDAY 16 NOVEMBER 2006 - AM

4B (i) Will the draft RSS help to secure mixed, cohesive, sustainable communities?

4B (ii) Are health and education issues adequately addressed in the draft RSS?

Panel Questions

How will the draft RSS help secure, mixed, cohesive and sustainable communities? Could it be improved in this respect?

Are there significant disparities or deficiencies in terms of:

- health standards (e.g. mortality and morbidity rates);
 - educational attainment;
 - worklessness;
 - crime rates;
 - accessibility to jobs, medical facilities, educational institutions, retail outlets, cultural opportunities, recreational facilities and open space?
- Does the RSS adequately address these matters?

In the final sentence of Policy L1, should "major developments" be defined? Should "recreational facilities" be added to "health, education and training"?

Is adequate provision made for expected changes in age structure?

Is adequate provision made for wheelchair access in residential development?

Should cul-de-sac development be prohibited, and greater emphasis be given to the reduction of traffic in residential streets and the provision of communal space?

Should greater emphasis be given to mixed use development, and the co-location of housing, employment and services?

Are there any other matters which participants wish to raise here which are not dealt with elsewhere?

MATTER 5A: OVERALL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

TUESDAY 9 JANUARY 2007 - AM

Preamble

The attention of participants is particularly drawn to the following:

- Regional Assembly Briefing Note 20 which contains suggested amendments to Chapter 10 and Appendix RT1/1 of the draft RSS;
- EiP/NWRA/2; EiP/AGMA/1; GONW's Briefing Paper No 2, pp23-25, which each contain proposals for amended transport objectives.

5A (i) Does the Regional Transport Strategy provide an appropriate long-term framework for highways and public transport in the region, reflecting other RSS policies and the RES?

Panel Questions

1 Various transport objectives have been proposed, which may be summarised as:

- supporting economic development and competitiveness;
- reducing the need to travel;
- encouraging a shift to more sustainable modes of transport;
- reducing congestion and improving journey time reliability;
- improving accessibility between homes and key destinations (e.g. jobs, schools, local centres);
- improving connectivity (for both passengers and freight) between major centres (including centres in other regions) and to key international gateways (e.g. ports, airports, main line stations);
- reducing adverse impacts of transport (e.g. noise, air quality, danger, severance);
- improving the prospects of regeneration in areas of economic decline;
- catering for the proposed distribution of significant development?

Are these objectives appropriate? Are there critical omissions? Are they of equal importance or should they be prioritised?

2 Would the proposed RSS policies help secure these objectives?

- 3 Should the RSS establish an explicit hierarchy of sustainable modes?
- 4 The Key Diagram shows major national and regional transport corridors? Is it adequate or are there significant gaps?
- 5 Appendix RT1/1 and Diagram RT1 shows the public transport framework, although NWRA now suggest a simplified version. Is the public transport framework shown in Appendix RT1.1 adequate? Is it too complex for a regional strategy? Does Diagram RT1.1 add value? Should it show place names? Should it identify significant gaps in provision, and points at which systems are consistently overcrowded, unreliable or otherwise in need of action? If so, where are they? Can they be prioritised – and according to what criteria? Is the alternative now proposed by NWRA an improvement (Briefing Paper 20 p52 et seq)? Would it be adequate?
- 6 Appendix RT2.1 and Diagram RT2.1 show the functional road hierarchy. Is this unduly complex for a regional strategy? If so how should it be simplified? Should road numbers/place names be shown on the diagram? Should parts of the strategic network that are consistently congested, unreliable or otherwise unsatisfactory be identified? If so, where are these? Can they be prioritised? What criteria should be used? Should all roads in the strategic network and sub-regional networks be open to HGVs as a matter of policy?
- 7 Should an integrated, multi-modal approach be adopted to transport policy, as suggested by AGMA? If so, how is co-operation between various providers to be achieved? How would this affect policies and priorities in the RSS?
- 8 Have the RTS policies been correctly identified in the draft RSS? If not, what changes are needed? Should the RTS policies be brought together in a separate Appendix?
- 9 Would the south of Crewe be a suitable location for an inter-modal freight terminal?

5A (ii) How will the draft RSS's proposed patterns of development impact on the strategic highway and public transport networks?

Panel Questions

- 1 How do transport policies reflect the spatial development framework? What additional capacity is planned to serve the new development proposed?
- 2 What would be the transport consequences of regionally significant economic development in the broad locations proposed in Policy W2? The Highway Agency's evidence is that some of these locations are not very accessible by non car modes, and are served by sections of the road network that are under stress.
- 3 What would be the transport consequences of residential development in the locations shown in Table 9.1?
- 4 Are there any other relevant matters that participants wish to raise here that are not dealt with elsewhere?

MATTER 5B: DEMAND MANAGEMENT

TUESDAY 9 JANUARY 2007 - PM

5B (i) Does the draft RSS provide clear and sufficient guidance on what is meant by demand management and when and where such measures might be used?

Panel Questions

- 1 How can demand management be introduced in a particular area, without harming its prospects for development and regeneration, relative to those of neighbouring areas? How should the work of local authorities be co-ordinated?
- 2 Which routes or locations should have priority for the introduction of increased demand management? What criteria should be applied?
- 3 Restrictive standards are already being applied in respect of the provision of private parking space in new development. How effective are they? Should they be tightened, for instance by applying the RPG13 "urban conurbation" standard to all regional towns, cities and key service centres? Should the RSS provide more guidance on public car parks in terms of provision and pricing policies?

- 4 Should there be a regional policy for “park and ride”?
 - 5 In what circumstances should road space be re-allocated in favour of public transport vehicles, goods vehicles, shared occupancy cars and/or cyclists?
 - 6 Should there be regional policies for cycling? Is the potential benefit of encouraging cycling reflected in funding allocations?
 - 7 Would restrictions on car use have adverse economic and social effects? What would these be? Should such restrictions be matched by commensurate public transport improvements? How would these be secured, and how would this affect investment priorities?
 - 8 Should there be a regional approach to road pricing and congestion charging, to avoid perverse effects arising from local initiatives? What provision should the RSS make for this?
 - 9 Are there any other relevant matters that participants wish to raise here that are not dealt with elsewhere?
-

MATTER 5C: TRANSPORT INVESTMENT AND MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES

WEDNESDAY 10 JANUARY 2007 – AM

5C (i) How do transport investment priorities, as set out in Tables 10.2 a-e address RSS and RES objectives? Do they take account of the likely resources available to deliver them?

5C (ii) How could Policy RT8 and Tables 10.2 a-e be improved in terms of setting achievable outcomes for transport improvements?

Panel Questions

- 1 Does Policy RT8 set out appropriate priorities? Would the priorities have been significantly different had equal weighting been given to economic, environmental and social criteria?
- 2 Table 10.2a-c provide for a higher level of investment in highway schemes than in public transport improvements. Despite this, does the RSS fail fully to recognise the importance of highway infrastructure, as asserted in some representations? Or does the

- balance accurately reflect regional priorities? Or should a greater emphasis be given to public transport?
- 3 Tables 10.2a-c exclude rail spending – what influence does the RSS have over this?
 - 4 How do the investment priorities shown in Table 10.2 relate to the proposed regional spatial framework and the major development proposals in the RSS?
 - 5 Do the investment priorities in Table 10.2 address the most serious shortcomings in the transport infrastructure? If not, what different outcomes should be sought? Have large schemes been favoured at the expense of smaller schemes which might offer a greater cumulative benefit?
 - 6 Should schemes in Tables 10.2b-e be reconsidered in the light of the Government's approval letter of 6 July 2006? Should a more focussed approach be adopted to establishing priorities between these schemes?
 - 7 Are schemes in Tables 10.2d-e realistic in view of the resources likely to be available (including RFA, TIF, rail funding etc)? Is sufficient account taken of the potential for private sector funding of transport proposals (including developer contributions, PFI schemes etc)? Are the start dates misleading? Should schemes which are not expected to start until after 2021 be excluded from the RSS?
 - 8 Are there any other relevant matters that participants wish to raise here that are not dealt with elsewhere?
-

MATTER 5D: AIRPORTS

WEDNESDAY 10 JANUARY 2007 – PM

Preamble

A number of participants have expressed understandable reservations about the Government's policy as set out in the 2003 White Paper "The Future of Air Transport", particularly in view of the propensity of aircraft to emit greenhouse gases that affect climate change. Nevertheless, paragraph 24 of PPS11 makes it clear that the Regional Spatial Strategy must be consistent with the conclusions of the White Paper.

In summary, the relevant conclusions of the White Paper are that Manchester Airport should be able to grow to accommodate up to 50 million passengers per annum (mppa) by 2030; that Liverpool John Lennon Airport should be able to grow to accommodate up to 12 mppa by 2030; that Blackpool Airport should be capable of developing the additional capacity needed to handle the level of traffic that it might attract; and that proposals should be brought forward for the development of Carlisle Airport to handle commercial flights. As it is not the purpose of the EiP to inquire into Government policy, discussion of the merits of these conclusions will not be permitted.

We understand that a revision to the Air Transport White Paper is expected, but this was not available in time to inform the following questions.

5D (i) Does Policy RT3 provide a sustainable strategic context for the development of, and surface access to, the region's airports, and is it consistent with other policies in the draft RSS and national policy context including the Air Transport White Paper 2003?

Panel Questions

- 1 Should the roles of the region's airports be defined more clearly, as suggested by GONW? If so, how?
- 2 Should Manchester Airport be the subject of a separate policy? If so, what should it say (*see SDL/AGMA/17*)?
- 3 Does the sequential test for the physical expansion of airports require clarification and/or simplification? Do the terms "existing boundary", "aviation related needs", and "operational activities and facilities" require definition? Are hotels, long-stay car parks, business parks, warehouses and other airport-related businesses "aviation related"? What are "operational activities that are not essential for the day to day function of the airport"? How do they differ from "other activities"? Why should the relocation of "operational activities" be considered before the relocation of "other activities"?
- 4 Does the first sentence of Policy RT3 imply that airports should be the location of economic activities that have no operational connection with their transport functions? If so, is this consistent with the sequential approach outlined in the policy? Should it be recognised in the economic policies of the RSS (eg Policies W1 and W2)? What are the implications of employment in the airports and co-located businesses for labour supply, housing and transport?

- Should non-essential commercial development around airports be constrained, as suggested by NW TAR?
- 5 Table 5.4 of the Technical Appendix indicates that, in the long term, 25% to 40% of passengers at Manchester Airport will use public transport for surface access (between 12.5 and 20 mppa on a throughput of 50 mppa). Will the proposed public transport improvements, including the third platform, other proposed rail improvements, and the proposed Metrolink extension, be sufficient to accommodate this level of use? Are any other public transport improvements envisaged? Are planned improvements to road access consistent with this objective? How will demand be managed to secure modal shift?
 - 6 The corresponding target for Liverpool John Lennon Airport is 15% to 25% (between 1.8 and 3 mppa on a throughput of 12 mppa). Are further public transport facilities planned to accommodate this? Table 5.4 of the Technical Appendix suggests guided bus/light rapid transit and light rail access to the city centre will be necessary – what is proposed?
 - 7 Lancashire County Council suggest that Blackpool Airport could handle up to 4 mppa by 2021. Table 5.4 of the Technical Appendix gives a public transport target of 10% to 15% for passengers travelling to and from an airport of this size (between 0.4 and 0.6 mppa). What public transport facilities are available or planned at Blackpool Airport, and what would their capacity be?
 - 8 How will Airport Master Plans relate to the statutory development plan?
 - 9 Should airport development be regulated in accordance with improvements in surface access, and by limits on noise and air pollution? If so how, and should the RSS make provision for this?
 - 10 Should airport parking be controlled to encourage modal shift? If so, how should this be dealt with in the RSS?
 - 11 Are there any other relevant matters that participants wish to raise here that are not dealt with elsewhere?
-

MATTER 6A: ENVIRONMENT AND LANDSCAPE

THURSDAY 11 JANUARY 2007 - AM

Preamble

These questions were prepared early in December. PPS 25 had just been published and the Panel were aware that a draft PPS (or addendum to existing PPS) on climate change was expected before Christmas. Parties should raise any points from these documents which bear directly on the issues under this matter.

The Panel are also expecting further briefing notes on certain topics, notably the redrafting of EM1, and water and sewerage. Parties should ensure that they are aware of these papers when they are available.

Parties are asked to address the questions which follow and not to repeat what is in their statements, which the Panel have read.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public. GONW have suggested (GONW BP2 - page 25) a set of objectives for this Chapter of the RSS. We wish to hear comments on these objectives.

6A (i) Should separate policies be used in this chapter to cover the individual aspects of (a) integrated land management incorporating woodland/ forestry, (b) biodiversity and (c) landscape and heritage (culture)? Are the policy tests sufficiently explicit?

6A (ii) Does the draft RSS provide an appropriate steer in relation to green infrastructure aspirations and requirements? How will this policy be implemented?

These two questions will be taken together because some parties have suggested that policies EM1 and 3 should be combined.

Panel Questions

In respect of policy EM1 the Panel is faced with a series of alternative suggestions for redrafting.

The most significant of these is perhaps that from Cumbria, Cheshire and Lancashire - which NWRA had invited (see para 1.4 of their statement). We have asked NWRA for a response to these proposals. We have also asked them to take into account the detailed revision by MPU dealing with "Natural Environment"; the outline revision from AGMA which combines EM1 and EM3 (SDL/AGMA/25); the outline policy on historic environment from English Heritage; and the proposal from CPRE on landscape and heritage.

We note that the proposal from Cumbria Cheshire and Lancashire, and the supporting arguments from the three Authorities, cover many (but perhaps not all) of the points raised by other parties such as LDNP, Natural England and National Trust.

We hope to focus the debate on the NWRAs response to these propositions, and will expect to take into account:

1. Whether the NWRA response to the Panel's request deals with the comments which people have made, or whether any reasons they have given for not making changes are accepted;
2. Whether EM1 should be split into several policies as some (but not many) suggest or whether EM1 and EM3 should be combined as AGMA (but not many others) suggest;
3. The extent to which the various suggestions either repeat national policy unnecessarily or deal with matters which would be more appropriately dealt with at local level;
4. Whether air quality should be mentioned here, or elsewhere, and what the RSS should say on the subject;
5. The extent to which the revised policy complies with PPS9.

Green Infrastructure

Notwithstanding the "in combination" issue above:

6. It is argued that policy EM3 is not sufficiently robust and prescriptive. However, unlike EM1, there have been few specific suggestions as to wording changes. What changes might the Panel recommend to make the policy more robust?
7. Should it for example place specific requirements on LAs in relation to LDDs?
8. Is Green Infrastructure not applicable to rural areas, as Cheshire suggest? Is there confusion – as they (and Lancashire) also

suggest – between the roles of GI and EF (ecological frameworks)?

9. There are many references to the Draft North West Green Infrastructure Guide – some critical and some not. This document is not before the Panel. But what further reference, if any, should be made to it in the RSS (beyond that in 11.5)?
10. Should parts of the explanatory text in the Technical Appendix be brought forward into the RSS itself?
11. On the somewhat complex question of implementation, a number of suggestions have been made, most of which involve the encouragement of partnership working. The Assembly's suggestions in para 2.4 of their statement found some favour. Some (e.g. Lancs Economic Partnership) refer to the need for sub-regional working. Can the parties suggest specific recommendations which the Panel could make to improve the prospects of satisfactory implementation?

6A (iii) Does the draft RSS take adequate account of the need to consider the implications of development in areas of flood risk?

Panel Questions

The final version of PPS 25 was published just as these questions were being prepared.

The Panel will expect all parties to be prepared to explain any implications of PPS 25, in relation to the points they have made in their evidence and statements, and to advise them of any amendments which they believe should be made to the Draft RSS as a result of it.

In the meantime we are in a position – not for the first time – where the policy is in a state of evolution, with Draft PPS 25 and its various requirements having emerged too late for inclusion. Further work has been carried out on this subject during 2006, including the preparation of the EA "Flood risk ranking for the N West Region" (SDL/EA/02). This may "...lead to a requirement for an early focussed review of RSS" (EA Statement).

In the light of this the Panel have the following questions:

1. To what extent if any might the present Draft RSS be altered to take account of the flood risk ranking (GONW imply in their statement that it might)?

2. Are there any implications arising from flood risk for the currently proposed broad locations for housing or employment (bearing in mind that the RSS is not site specific), or for transport infrastructure?
3. Given the developing situation, are the references to flood risk in policies EM5 and EM6 sufficient? (Note - EA put forward proposed amendments to EM5 in their evidence - 585/4164).
4. What is the process and timescale for the production of the regional flood risk assessment and any possible subsequent review of the RSS?

6A (iv) Are water resources and the capacity of both water and sewerage infrastructure adequately considered in the draft RSS?

Panel Questions

Work has continued on this topic since the Draft RSS was completed.

The Panel have asked for a further briefing note from EA and NWRA on water and sewerage, which was not available at the time these questions were drafted; it is expected that that note will provide a focus for debate. It is expected amongst other things to suggest changes to the Draft RSS.

In the light of this it is difficult for the Panel to frame questions; but on the basis of the statements they are likely to be interested in:

1. the implications of the growth proposed in the RSS (particularly housing growth) for water supplies and wastewater treatment capacity;
2. the solutions proposed by EA in their suggested amendments to policy EM5 (Original Rep 585/4164) and the proposals by EA/UU in their joint statement. Whether some of their proposals are outside the scope of the RSS (as HBF suggest);
3. whether a policy on wastewater sludge as suggested by UU in their statement (p4) should be added to RSS.

Are there any other relevant points which the parties wish to make?

MATTER 6B: MINERALS AND WASTE

THURSDAY 11 JANUARY 2007 – PM

FRIDAY 12 JANUARY 2007 - AM

Preamble

The discussion of waste policy will begin on the afternoon of 11 January and may continue on the morning of 12 January if necessary.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 (pp30-34) produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 (pp25-27) produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

6B (i) Is the evidence base used to inform the capacity requirements set out in Table 11.3, 11.4 and 11.5 robust?

Panel Questions

- 1 Have the proposals for residential development, employment etc in the draft RSS been taken into account in Tables 11.3 - 11.5?
- 2 Table 11.3 shows the typical annual capacity required to deal with commercial and industrial waste, based on existing patterns and the achievement of RWS targets. Why is there no projected change, to reflect the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy during the RSS period? Should the Table reflect the Government's current forecasts? Why is composting capacity shown as zero? Should greater provision be made for thermal treatment capacity?
- 3 Should non-hazardous construction/demolition wastes be accounted for in Table 11.3 or is a separate policy required? What capacity will be required and how should it be apportioned?
- 4 Given the acknowledged inadequacy of the data, is it desirable to retain Table 11.3 in the RSS? Should it be reduced to show simply the landfill requirement and other treatments, as suggested by the Waste Recycling Group? Is it sufficient to leave the projected commercial and industrial waste capacity requirement to be addressed through RWS monitoring reports? Should there be an early review of RSS with regard to this matter?
- 5 Should Table 11.4 include an apportionment of hazardous waste capacity between WPAs? Does it include provision for hazardous

- construction/demolition waste? When will the regional capacity requirement for hazardous wastes be known (taking account of reclassification)? Should this also be the subject of a review of RSS?
- 6 Should Table 11.5 give details of the baseline figures for municipal waste management capacity? Are the targets achievable (Cumbria), or are they insufficiently ambitious (CPRE, NW Community Waste Network)? Should thermal treatment capacity be separated out, as in Table 11.3? Should Table 11.5 also include provision for refuse transfer/bulking stations (Cumbria CC)? Should it reflect the waste management strategies already being followed by WPAs/WDAs?
 - 7 Do Tables 11.3 – 11.5 account for regional imports and exports of waste, and waste movements between sub-regions or WPA areas? Can adequate landfill capacity be provided in each sub-region? If not, how much waste must be exported to landfill elsewhere, and how is the capacity requirement to be apportioned? Are the capacities so restrictive as to limit future investment in waste management technologies?
 - 8 Do Tables 11.3 - 11.5 provide an adequate basis for the preparation of local development documents on waste?

6B (ii) Are the waste policies in the draft RSS consistent with PPS10? If not, what changes should be made to the draft RSS?

Panel Questions

- 1 Paragraph 6 of PPS10 requires the waste management strategy to look forward for a 15-20 year period, but Tables 11.3 – 11.5 of the draft RSS only cover the period to 2020? Can this be rectified?
- 2 Should the Regional Waste Strategy objectives and targets be made explicit in Policy EM10? Or are these targets excessive (e.g. 35% target for household waste recycling/composting compared with 30% target in National Waste Strategy) and should reference to them be deleted? Should RSS/RWS targets for waste minimisation, recycling and recovery accord with national targets?
- 3 Should Policy EM11 refer to waste minimisation and the other initiatives listed in paragraph 11.21? Should there be a separate policy on waste minimisation?
- 4 Do the references to the “proximity principle” and “self sufficiency” in Policy EM12 adequately reflect current Government policy? How

do these principles (and Policies EM12 and EM13) relate to waste facilities of national, regional or sub-regional significance?

- 5 Is Policy EM14 adequate in dealing with radioactive waste? Can sufficient capacity be made available to accommodate waste from decommissioning nuclear facilities? What is the scale of this problem, and what solution is proposed?

6B (iii) Is there a need for the draft RSS to provide a clearer direction in terms of waste apportionment and waste management facilities that will be required at the regional and sub-regional level; e.g. should RSS advise on the broad location of facilities?

Panel Questions

- 1 Should the RSS identify waste management facilities that are of national, regional or sub-regional significance (including hazardous waste facilities)? Have any additional requirements been identified? Should broad locations or locational criteria for these be established? Has there been any discussion with adjacent regions/nations? Should proposals for the broad locations of facilities of national, regional or sub-regional significance be contingent on the agreement of the recipient WPA? Does the Banks Report "A Waste Strategy for the North West" (2004) provide a sufficient evidence base on which to identify broad locations for the requisite national, regional and sub-regional facilities? If broad locations cannot be identified now, should there be an early review of RSS?
- 2 Should apportionments reflect regional and sub-regional waste imports and exports, and the likely availability of capacity? Should those WPAs which are to accommodate additional treatment capacity to compensate for a landfill deficit be identified?
- 3 Should the RSS promote joint working between WPAs? What is the current position on the production of joint LDDs? Should apportionment be made between Warrington and Halton? Should this be on the basis of population, area or what?
- 4 Should a distinction be made between primary waste management facilities, to be provided locally, and secondary or strategic facilities (as listed in paragraph 11.30 of the draft RSS) to be provided regionally?

- 5 Does the RSS take sufficient account of the capacity of the environment to accommodate large scale waste management facilities?

6B (iv) Is the inclusion of peat as a mineral reserve to be extracted appropriate?

Panel Questions

- 1 Insofar as it refers to peat, is Policy EM7 consistent with national policy as set out in MPG13? Are there any special circumstances that would justify a departure from national planning policy as regards this matter in the North West Region?
-

MATTER 6C: ENERGY

TUESDAY 23 JANUARY 2007

Preamble

These questions were prepared early in December. PPS 25 had just been published and the Panel were aware that a draft PPS (or addendum to existing PPS) on climate change was expected before Christmas. Parties should raise any points from these documents which bear directly on the issues under this matter.

Once again the policies (EM15-17) are in a state of evolution rather than completion. In this case, however, this is in large measure (though perhaps, some would allege, not entirely) because this is a fast-changing area. Much has happened since the Draft RSS was produced and even since the EIP opened.

The attention of participants is drawn particularly to the suite of changes suggested to these policies in the NWRA Briefing Note No 20 pp 37-42.

Attention is also drawn to the comments in GONW Briefing Paper 2 pp 25-27.

The Panel will consider questions 6C (i) and (iii) together. Many of the comments by participants on (i) relate to the issues raised in (iii). Very few points were raised under 6C (ii) but a brief opportunity for debate will be provided before moving on to 6C (iv).

6C (i) Are the renewable energy policies consistent with national guidance?

6C (iii) Are the renewable energy targets set out in EM17 and Tables 11.6 and 11.7 sufficiently justified and achievable?

Panel Questions

1. A number of participants have questioned the absence of a plan indicating broad locations for renewable technologies in the region. Why is this not included and how can this omission be rectified?

The targets

2. A number of parties have suggested that the regional targets (Table 11.6) are not based on an adequate evidence base. In particular no form of landscape quality assessment has been carried out across the region. Is the evidence base for the regional targets satisfactory?
3. The targets are described as “Indicative regional renewable energy generation targets”. Policy EM17 says that they are to be met “as a minimum”. Parties have queried the status of these targets and said that they should more properly be described as aspirations or indications of potential. How should they be described?
4. Parties have suggested that the targets are not achievable. In part this is based on the low level of the starting point, and in many areas it is based on the assessment by Local Authorities of the potential which exists in their areas – which they say is lower than the RSS assumes. Are the targets achievable? Some wish to see lower figures – would this be satisfactory given national policies?
5. Is the inclusion of technology-specific policies in the form shown in the tables acceptable?

Sub regional targets

6. Is the evidence base for the sub-regional breakdown in Table 11.7 adequate?
7. Are these targets too rigid or too prescriptive?

8. How are the sub-regional studies mentioned in Policy EM 17 to be organised, implemented and enforced?

The criteria

9. Are the criteria set out in policy EM 17 acceptable? Do they need, as Lancashire in particular suggest, a more positive element?

On-site generation

10. In the last paragraph of policy EM17: are the thresholds appropriate? Should there be greater flexibility?

Review

11. NWRA have suggested an addition to the text to deal with the need for review (BP 20 p 39, referring to 11.46 in the draft RSS). A number of parties have raised this. Does this addition deal with the point?

Other

12. Is further reference to liaison with the Distribution Operators (DNOs) needed; if so what form should it take?
13. Do parties have any comments on the other suggested additions, except for those dealt with under (iv) below, from the Assembly which relate to these subjects? Do they have any comments on the proposed amendments from Renewables Northwest (p1)?

6C (ii) Is the draft RSS sufficiently compatible with the outcomes of the Energy Review 2006?

Panel Questions

1. Are there any further comments on this topic?

6C (iv) Does the draft RSS provide appropriate guidance on the need to reduce demand and increase energy efficiency?

Panel Questions

1. NWRA have proposed three amendments in Briefing Paper 20 which go at least some way to addressing the points raised in representations.

On p 38 they suggest a change to para 11.45 which refers to the setting of targets through the Climate Change Action Plan. They do not suggest incorporating the targets at M1 of the Consultation draft. Does this change deal with the points made about targets and the need to refer to the Action Plan, or is further change needed?

2. On p 38 they suggest a change to policy EM16 to introduce a reference to BREEAM ratings. Does this deal with the points raised on this issue? Should BREEAM also be mentioned in policy L4?
 3. The HBF argue that some of the policies in the Draft RSS, such as this one, duplicate or cut across other legislative regimes. Is this a problem?
 4. The third change suggested in BP 20, on p 37, is a change to policy EM15 to deal with combined heat and power. Is this accepted?
 5. In general, some parties have argued that policy EM16 is not sufficiently robust. In what ways, if any, should it be changed? (Note – FoE suggested 2 specific changes)
 6. Are there any other relevant points which the parties wish to make?
-

MATTER 7A: MANCHESTER CITY REGION AND SOUTH CHESHIRE - SUB REGIONAL STRATEGY

TUESDAY 16 JANUARY 2007

Preamble

The Panel do not intend to produce additional questions for matters 7-10, but offer the following guidance to assist participants.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

Participants should so far as possible make themselves aware of the discussions which have already taken place during the EiP. The Panel accept that there may be some repetition of previous debates but would obviously wish to keep it to a minimum.

Parties who have previously taken part in the EiP should not repeat evidence which they have already given.

Participants are asked not to repeat what is in their statements, which the Panel have read. Where they wish the Panel to recommend changes to the Draft RSS participants should be as precise as possible as to the change they wish to see.

7A (i) Does the strategy communicate a clear, sustainable and appropriate vision for the sub-region? If not, how should the strategy be modified? In particular:

- **do the proposals for employment, housing, transport and the environment amount collectively to a coherent and appropriate vision for the sub region;**
- **are the proposals for employment land (of various kinds) appropriate and achievable;**
- **are the transport proposals adequate and logical in relation to the strategy as a whole;**
- **is adequate attention paid to issues of climate change and the protection of the environment;**
- **are there any other material deficiencies, which you perceive in the plan as it affects the sub-region;**
- **do you believe the proposals to be deliverable, through the development plan system or in other ways;**

- **the extent to which cross-border issues have been considered, especially in relation to High Peak;**
- **how will the sub-regional sub-area priorities be monitored.**

The purpose of these questions, which are the same for each sub-region, is essentially to provide an opportunity for those who have not previously been invited to take part in the EiP – particularly the District Councils – to put to the Panel those points which they believe to be particularly important.

Housing will not be discussed under this item.

7A (ii) Is there an inconsistency in the strategy as it affects the Manchester City Region in that most of the economic opportunities are said to be in the southern parts whereas most of the housing is not? If so, does this raise issues of sustainability?

7A (iii) Are there any issues affecting the South Cheshire sub-region which might require the plan to be modified?

These are questions which are specific to each sub-region. Some of them have been previously discussed at various points in the EiP but the Panel wish to hear views from the area concerned.

MATTER 7B: MANCHESTER CITY REGION AND SOUTH CHESHIRE - HOUSING ISSUES

WEDNESDAY 17 JANUARY 2007 - AM

Preamble

The total housing figures for the region were discussed in Matter 4; the purpose of this discussion is to consider the distribution between Local Authorities (and the PDL targets). Participants may find it helpful to look at the questions which the Panel asked under Matter 4 page 2 (Distribution of the proposed housing)

7B (i) Is the sub-region's housing provision and distribution appropriate and achievable? Are the PDL targets in Table 9.1 realistic, deliverable, and based on robust evidence?

MATTER 8A: LIVERPOOL CITY REGION - SUB REGIONAL STRATEGY

WEDNESDAY 17 JANUARY 2007 - PM

Preamble

The Panel do not intend to produce additional questions for matters 7-10, but offer the following guidance to assist participants.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

Participants should so far as possible make themselves aware of the discussions which have already taken place during the EiP. The Panel accept that there may be some repetition of previous debates but would obviously wish to keep it to a minimum.

Parties who have previously taken part in the EiP should not repeat evidence which they have already given.

Participants are asked not to repeat what is in their statements, which the Panel have read. Where they wish the Panel to recommend changes to the Draft RSS participants should be as precise as possible as to the change they wish to see.

8A (i) Does the strategy communicate a clear, sustainable and appropriate vision for the sub-region? If not, how should the strategy be modified? In particular:

- **do the proposals for employment, housing, transport and the environment amount collectively to a coherent and appropriate vision for the sub region;**
- **are the proposals for employment land (of various kinds) appropriate and achievable;**
- **are the transport proposals adequate and logical in relation to the strategy as a whole;**
- **is adequate attention paid to issues of climate change and the protection of the environment;**
- **are there any other material deficiencies, which you perceive in the plan as it affects the sub-region;**
- **do you believe the proposals to be deliverable, through the development plan system or in other ways;**

- **how will the sub-regional sub-area priorities be monitored.**

The purpose of these questions, which are the same for each sub-region, is essentially to provide an opportunity for those who have not previously been invited to take part in the EiP – particularly the District Councils – to put to the Panel those points which they believe to be particularly important.

Housing will not be discussed under this item.

8A (ii) Does LCR4 adequately reflect the policies and strategy emerging from the West Cheshire/ North East Wales Sub-Regional Strategy?

This question is specific to the sub-region. Some of these issues have been previously discussed at various points in the EiP but the Panel wish to hear views from the area concerned.

MATTER 8B: LIVERPOOL CITY REGION - HOUSING ISSUES

THURSDAY 18 JANUARY 2007 - AM

Preamble

The total housing figures for the region were discussed in Matter 4; the purpose of this discussion is to consider the distribution between Local Authorities (and the PDL targets). Participants may find it helpful to look at the questions which the Panel asked under Matter 4 page 2 (Distribution of the proposed housing)

8B (i) Is the sub-region's housing provision and distribution appropriate and achievable? Are the PDL targets in Table 9.1 realistic, deliverable, and based on robust evidence?

MATTER 9A: CENTRAL LANCASHIRE CITY REGION - SUB REGIONAL STRATEGY

WEDNESDAY 24 JANUARY 2007 - AM

Preamble

The Panel do not intend to produce additional questions for matters 7-10, but offer the following guidance to assist participants.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

Participants should so far as possible make themselves aware of the discussions which have already taken place during the EiP. The Panel accept that there may be some repetition of previous debates but would obviously wish to keep it to a minimum.

Parties who have previously taken part in the EiP should not repeat evidence which they have already given.

Participants are asked not to repeat what is in their statements, which the Panel have read. Where they wish the Panel to recommend changes to the Draft RSS participants should be as precise as possible as to the change they wish to see.

9A (i) Does the strategy communicate a clear, sustainable and appropriate vision for the sub-region? If not, how should the strategy be modified? In particular:

- **do the proposals for employment, housing, transport and the environment amount collectively to a coherent and appropriate vision for the sub region;**
- **are the proposals for employment land (of various kinds) appropriate and achievable;**
- **are the transport proposals adequate and logical in relation to the strategy as a whole;**
- **is adequate attention paid to issues of climate change and the protection of the environment;**
- **are there any other material deficiencies, which you perceive in the plan as it affects the sub-region;**
- **do you believe the proposals to be deliverable, through the development plan system or in other ways;**

- **how will the sub-regional sub-area priorities be monitored.**

The purpose of these questions, which are the same for each sub-region, is essentially to provide an opportunity for those who have not previously been invited to take part in the EiP – particularly the District Councils – to put to the Panel those points which they believe to be particularly important.

Housing will not be discussed under this item.

9A (ii) Does the Central Lancashire City Region have any coherence in functional, social/cultural, geographic or economic terms?

9A (iii) Should the draft RSS provide a more proactive and coherent framework for the regeneration of the East Lancashire Towns?

These are questions which are specific to the sub-region. Some of the issues have been previously discussed at various points in the EiP but the Panel wish to hear views from the area concerned.

MATTER 9B: CENTRAL LANCASHIRE CITY REGION - HOUSING ISSUES

WEDNESDAY 24 JANUARY 2007 - PM

Preamble

The total housing figures for the region were discussed in Matter 4; the purpose of this discussion is to consider the distribution between Local Authorities (and the PDL targets). Participants may find it helpful to look at the questions which the Panel asked under Matter 4 page 2 (Distribution of the proposed housing)

9B (i) Is the sub-region's housing provision and distribution appropriate and achievable? Are the PDL targets in Table 9.1 realistic, deliverable, and based on robust evidence?

MATTER 10A: CUMBRIA AND NORTH LANCASHIRE CITY REGION - SUB REGIONAL STRATEGY

THURSDAY 25 JANUARY 2007 - AM

Preamble

The Panel do not intend to produce additional questions for matters 7-10, but offer the following guidance to assist participants.

The attention of participants is drawn to Briefing Note 20 produced by the North West Regional Assembly, and to Briefing Note 2 produced by the Government Office for the North West. Both documents contain suggested revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which may be discussed throughout the Examination in Public.

Participants should so far as possible make themselves aware of the discussions which have already taken place during the EiP. The Panel accept that there may be some repetition of previous debates but would obviously wish to keep it to a minimum.

Parties who have previously taken part in the EiP should not repeat evidence which they have already given.

Participants are asked not to repeat what is in their statements, which the Panel have read. Where they wish the Panel to recommend changes to the Draft RSS participants should be as precise as possible as to the change they wish to see.

10A (i) Does the strategy communicate a clear, sustainable and appropriate vision for the sub-region? If not, how should the strategy be modified? In particular:

- **do the proposals for employment, housing, transport and the environment amount collectively to a coherent and appropriate vision for the sub region;**
- **are the proposals for employment land (of various kinds) appropriate and achievable;**
- **are the transport proposals adequate and logical in relation to the strategy as a whole;**
- **is adequate attention paid to issues of climate change and the protection of the environment;**
- **are there any other material deficiencies, which you perceive in the plan as it affects the sub-region;**
- **do you believe the proposals to be deliverable, through the development plan system or in other ways;**

- **the extent to which cross-border issues have been considered, especially in relation to Scotland;**
- **how will the sub-regional sub-area priorities be monitored.**

The purpose of these questions, which are the same for each sub-region, is essentially to provide an opportunity for those who have not previously been invited to take part in the EiP – particularly the District Councils – to put to the Panel those points which they believe to be particularly important.

Housing will not be discussed under this item.

10A (ii) Do the sub-regional policies sufficiently address issues arising from the Energy Review 2006?

This question is specific to the sub-region. Some of these issues have been previously discussed at various points in the EiP but the Panel wish to hear views from the area concerned.

**MATTER 10B: CUMBRIA AND NORTH LANCASHIRE CITY REGION
- HOUSING ISSUES**

THURSDAY 25 JANUARY 2007 - PM

Preamble

The total housing figures for the region were discussed in Matter 4; the purpose of this discussion is to consider the distribution between Local Authorities (and the PDL targets). Participants may find it helpful to look at the questions which the Panel asked under Matter 4 page 2 (Distribution of the proposed housing)

10B (i) Is the sub-region's housing provision and distribution appropriate and achievable? Are the PDL targets in Table 9.1 realistic, deliverable, and based on robust evidence?

MATTER 11A-C: DELIVERY, MONITORING, IMPLEMENTATION AND REVIEW

FRIDAY 26 JANUARY 2007 - AM

Preamble

The Panel will not be producing additional questions for Matter 11 but will rely on the questions which were previously circulated in the Final List of Matters and Participants.

The attention of participants is particularly drawn to the NWRA Briefing Paper 19, and in relation to question 11C (viii), to their Briefing Note 11.

Many of the issues raised by these questions, especially in relation to question 11A (i) have already been discussed during the EIP and the Panel ask participants to seek to avoid repetition.

MATTER 11A: DELIVERY

11A (i) Could the clarity and consistency of the draft RSS be improved? Is the draft RSS “user friendly” in terms of understanding the strategy and how the policies are to be implemented?

11A (ii) Does the draft RSS provide an appropriate level of detail for the preparation of Local Development Documents? Does it provide appropriate guidance for other local plans (e.g. LTPs) and delivery mechanisms? Do the proposals in Chapter 19 of the RSS adequately provide for the transition from Structure Plans to the new LDF system?

MATTER 11B: MONITORING

11B (iii) Are there sufficient processes in place such as Annual Monitoring Reports, to ensure that the impacts of the RSS can be monitored? Have the right targets and indicators been identified in the Implementation Framework to ensure the RSS can be effectively monitored?

11B (iv) Should the draft RSS include a specific policy for monitoring?

MATTER 11C: IMPLEMENTATION AND REVIEW

11C (v) Are there sufficient and appropriate links to delivery agencies and funding mechanisms to ensure delivery?

11C (vi) Are the implementation mechanisms appropriate for addressing any cross-border issues that may arise?

11C (vii) Is there a need for a focused early review of the RSS? If so, what should be the focus and timetable, and what would be the implications for Local Development Documents?

11C (viii) When will the research mentioned in paragraph 9.11 on the future requirements for gypsies and travellers be completed and how will this be incorporated into the RSS?

**Appendix D Core Documents; Submitted Documents
and EIP Documents**

**DRAFT REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY
FOR THE NORTH WEST**

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

<p>CORE DOCUMENT LIST</p>

Email: secretariat@northwesteip.co.uk

Core Document List – Version 7 (amended 3 March 2007)

DEVELOPMENT PLANS

	CHESHIRE
CH1a	Cheshire Structure Plan Review www.cheshire.gov.uk/Structure+Plan
CH1b	Cheshire Replacement Minerals Local Plan, 1999 www.cheshire.gov.uk/Minerals Local Plan
CH1c	Cheshire Waste Local Plan www.cheshire.gov.uk/Waste Local Plan
CH2a	Deposit Draft Chester District Local Plan – Proposed Modifications, April 2003 www.chester.gov.uk/Draft Chester Local plan
CH2b	Deposit Draft Chester District Local Plan – Further Proposed Modifications, June 2004 www.chester.gov.uk/Draft Chester District Local plan
CH2c	Deposit Draft Chester District Local Plan – Further Proposed Modifications, October 2005 www.chester.gov.uk/Draft Chester District Local plan
CH3	Congleton Borough Local Plan – First Review, January 2005 http://www.congleton.gov.uk/Local Plan
CH4	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council Replacement Local Plan 2011, February 2005 www.crewe-nantwich.gov.uk
CH5a	Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Local Plan, June 2002 Adopted Local Plan
CH6a	Macclesfield Borough Local Plan, January 2004 Local Plan
CH7	Adopted Vale Royal Borough Local Plan First Review Alteration – Committee Draft, June 2006 Local Plan
	CUMBRIA
CU1a	Cumbria & Lake District Joint Structure Plan, Adopted April 2006 (Published November 2006) Planning Cumbria: Adopted Structure Plan : Adopted Structure Plan
CU1b	Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan 2001 – 2016 Modifications, September 2005 www.cumbria.gov.uk/Joint Structure Plan
CU1c	Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan, Panel Report, 2004 www.planningcumbria.org/elibrary
CU2a	Allerdale Local Plan, November 1999 Allerdale Borough Council - Housing, building & planning
CU2b	Allerdale Local Plan – First Alteration, May 2006 Allerdale Borough Council - Housing, building & planning
CU3a	Borough of Barrow-in-Furness Local Plan Review 1996-2006, June 2006 Barrow Borough Council - Local Plan
CU4	Carlisle Local Plan 2001-2016, Redeposit Draft, 2005 Carlisle City Council - Planning
CU5	Copeland Local Plan 2001-2016 (Currently only available on-line) Copeland Planning Policy
CU6	Eden Local Plan, December 1996 Eden DC: Planning and Development
CU7a	Lake District National Park Local Plan, May 1998 (Including Proposals Maps & Inset Maps) Lake District National Park Authority - Planning
CU7b	Lake District National Park Management Plan 2004, April 2004 Lake District National Park Authority - Planning
CU8a	South Lakeland Local Plan 2006, September 1997 South Lakeland District Council : Local Plan
CU8b	South Lakeland Local Plan 2006 Alteration – Composite Plan, March 2004 South Lakeland District Council : Local Plan

GREATER MANCHESTER	
GM1	Unitary Development Plan for Bolton, April 2005 www.bolton.gov.uk
GM2a	Bury Unitary Development Plan, August 1997 Bury Metropolitan Borough Council
GM3	High Peak Local Plan, March 2005 www.highpeak.gov.uk
GM4a	The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, July 1995 Manchester City Council: Planning: Planning Strategy
GM5a	Oldham Unitary Development Plan Review – 2001 to 2016: Replacement Unitary Development Plan Revised Deposit Draft, October 2003 www.oldham.gov.uk/living/planbuildmatters
GM5b	Oldham Unitary Development Plan Review – 2001 to 2016: Proposed Modifications to the Draft Replacement UDP, February 2006 www.oldham.gov.uk/living/planbuildmatters
GM6a	Rochdale Unitary Development Plan Review: 2001-2016 – First Deposit Draft Replacement Plan – Proposals Maps East & West, June 2002 www.rochdale.gov.uk/Living/housing
GM6b	Rochdale Unitary Development Plan Review: 2001-2016 – Revised Deposit Draft Replacement Plan, April 2003 www.rochdale.gov.uk/Living/housing
GM6c	Rochdale Unitary Development Plan Review: 2001-2016 – Statement of Decisions on Inspectors Report and Proposed Modifications, November 2005 www.rochdale.gov.uk/Living/housing
GM7a	Salford Unitary Development Plan , June 2006 www.salford.gov.uk/plan-policies
GM8	Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review, May 2006 www.stockport.gov.uk
GM8a	Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review Appendix 9 Erratum (Parking Standards), November 2006
GM9a	The Tameside Unitary Development Plan, November 2004 www.tameside.gov.uk/udp
GM10a	Trafford Unitary Development Plan Review Proposed Adopted Plan Text, May 2006 http://www.trafford.gov.uk
GM11a	Wigan Unitary Development Plan www.wigan.gov.uk/pub/planning
LANCASHIRE	
LA1	The Joint Lancashire Structure Plan 2001-2016, March 2005 (Including Parking Standards and SPG ‘Access and Parking’) Lancashire CC Planning
LA2a	Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 (Provisional Edition), June 2006 Blackpool Council
LA2b	Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 – Schedule of Changes to First Deposit Draft Local Plan, June 2006 Blackpool Council
LA3a	Blackburn with Darwen Borough Local Plan, April 2002 www.blackburn.gov.uk
LA4a	Burnley Borough Council Local Plan (No hard copy yet available due to legal challenge) Burnley Borough Council - Local Plan
LA5	Chorley Borough Local Plan Review, August 2003 Chorley Borough Council - Planning

LA6a	Flyde Borough Local Plan As Altered, October 2005 Fylde Borough Council
LA7a	Borough of Hyndburn Local Plan, November 1996 Planning
LA7b	Borough of Hyndburn Local Plan – Changes and Corrections to the Proposals Map, September 2000 Planning
LA8	Lancaster District Local Plan 1996-2006, April 2004 Lancaster City Council - Forward Planning
LA9	Pendle Replacement Local Plan 2001-2016, May 2006 www.pendle.gov.uk
LA10	Preston Local Plan, April 2004 Preston - Planning Policy Division
LA11	Ribble Valley Local Plan, 1998 Districtwide Local Plan - Introduction - Ribble Valley Borough Council
LA12a	Rossendale District Local Plan, April 1995 Rossendale Borough Council
LA12b	Rossendale - Statement of Non-Conformity with the Adopted Joint Lancashire Structure Plan 2001-2016, Lancashire County Council, July 2005 Rossendale Borough Council
LA13	South Ribble Local Plan – Proposal Map, February 2000 South Ribble Borough Council
LA14	West Lancashire Replacement Local Plan, 2006 (Hard copies not currently available) West Lancashire District Council - Planning & Environment - Planning Policy and Development Plans
LA15	Wyre Borough Local Plan 1991-2006, July 1999 Wyre Borough Council - Planning Policy - Introduction
	MERSEYSIDE
ME1a	Knowsley Unitary Development Plan http://planning.knowsley.gov.uk
ME2a	Liverpool Unitary Development Plan, November 2002 Liverpool City Council Local Development Framework
ME3a	Halton Unitary Development Plan, April 2005 http://www2.halton.gov.uk
ME4a	St Helens Unitary Development Plan, July 1998 www.sthelens.gov.uk
ME5	Sefton Unitary Development Plan, Revised Deposit Draft Including Proposed Modifications www/sefton.gov.uk
ME5a	Sefton Unitary Development Plan – Adopted, June 2006 (Currently only available on-line) www/sefton.gov.uk
ME6	Warrington Unitary Development Plan, January 2006 www.warrington.gov.uk/news/udp/
ME7	Wirral Unitary Development Plan (including minerals and waste policies), February 2000 www.wirral.gov.uk

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE/STATEMENTS

PP1	PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development, 2005 Planning Policy Statement 1
PP2	PPG2: Green Belts, 1995 (Amended 2001) Planning Policy Guidance 2
PP3a	PPG3: Housing, 2000 Replaced by PPS3 Planning Policy Guidance 3: Housing 2000

PP3b	PPG3: Update: Supporting the Delivery of New Housing, 2005 <u>Update to PPG 3: Housing: Supporting the Delivery of New Housing 2005</u>
PP3c	PPG3: Update: Planning for Sustainable Communities in Rural Areas, 2005 <u>Update to PPG 3: Housing: Planning for Sustainable Communities 2005</u>
PP3d	Consultation Paper on a New Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) Housing (Closing date: 27 February 2006) <u>www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1162075</u>
PPS3e	Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing <u>Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing - Communities and Local Government</u> REPLACES PPG3 (MARCH 2000)
PP4	PPG4: Industrial, Commercial Development and Small Firms, 1992 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 4</u>
PP5	PPG5: Simplified Planning Zones, 1992 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 5</u>
PP6a	PPS6: Planning for Town Centres, 2005 <u>Planning Policy Statement 6</u>
PP6b	Planning for Town Centres: Guidance on Design and Implementation Tools, Companion guidance for PPS6, ODPM, March 2005 <u>Planning Policy Statement 6: Companion Guide</u>
PP7	PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, 2004 <u>Planning Policy Statement 7</u>
PP8	PPG8: Telecommunications, 2001 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 8</u>
PP9	PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, 2005 <u>Planning Policy Statement 9</u>
PP10a	PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, 2005 <u>Planning Policy Statement 10</u>
PP10b	PPS10: Companion Guide to Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, 2006 <u>Planning Policy Statement 10: Companion Guide</u>
PP11	PPS11: Regional Spatial Strategies, 2004 <u>Planning Policy Statement 11</u>
PP12a	PPS12: Local Development Frameworks, 2004 <u>Planning Policy Statement 12</u>
PP12b	Creating Local Development Frameworks, A Companion Guide to PPS12 <u>Planning Policy Statement 12</u>
PP12c	Local Development Framework Monitoring: A Good Practice Guide, 2005 <u>Planning Policy Statement 12</u>
PP13	PPG13: Transport, 2001 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 13</u>
PP14	PPG14: Development on Unstable Land, 1990 & Annex 1- Landslides and Planning, 1996, & Annex 2 Subsidence and Planning, 2002 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 14</u>
PP15	PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment, 1994 (See also Circulars 01/2001 and 09/2005) <u>Planning Policy Guidance 15</u>
PP16	PPG16: Archaeology and Planning, 1990 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 16</u>
PP17	PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, 2002 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 17</u>
PP18	PPG18: Enforcing Planning Control, 1991 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 18</u>
PP19	PPG19: Outdoor Advertisement Control, 1992 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 19</u>
PP20	PPG20: Coastal Planning, 1992 <u>Planning Policy Guidance 20</u>

PP21	PPG21: Tourism, 1992 Planning Policy Guidance 21
PP22a	PPS22: Renewable Energy, 2004 Planning Policy Statement 22
PP22b	PPS22: Planning for Renewable Energy: A Companion Guide, 2004 Planning Policy Statement 22
PP23	PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control, 2004 & Annex 1 – Pollution Control, Air and Water Quality, 2004, Annex 2 – Development on Land Affected by Contamination, 2004 Planning Policy Statement 23
PP24	PPG24: Planning and Noise, 1994 Planning Policy Guidance 24
PP25a	PPG25: Development and Flood Risk, 2001 Planning Policy Guidance 25
PP25b	Consultation on Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk, ODPM, December 2005 www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1162059

MINERAL PLANNING GUIDANCE

MP1a	MPG1: General Considerations and the Development Plan System, 1996 Minerals Planning Guidance 1
MP1b	MPS1: Consultation Paper on Planning & Minerals & Associated Good Practice Guidance, November 2004 Minerals Policy Statement 1
MP1c	Consultation Paper on Annexes to Minerals Policy Statement 1: Planning and Minerals – Supply of Aggregates, Brick Clay, Building and Roofing Stone, and Onshore Oil and Gas, in England, July 2005 Minerals Policy Statement 1 - Consultation Paper on Annexes
MP1d	MPS1 Minerals Policy Statement 1 – Planning and Minerals, 2006 Minerals Policy Statement 1
MP1e	MPS1 Minerals Policy Statement 1 – Practice Guide, 2006 Minerals Policy Statement - practice guide
MP2	MPS2: Controlling and Mitigating the Environmental Effects of Mineral Extraction in England, 2005 (Supersedes MPG11) Mineral Policy Statement 2
MP3	MPG13: Guidelines for Peat Provision in England, 1995 Minerals Planning Guidance 13

CASINOS

CAS1	Casinos in England’s Northwest - An Assessment of Market Demand, Final Report, Pion Economics, June 2005 http://www.nwda.co.uk
------	---

ECONOMY

ECO1	Our Competitive Future: Building the Knowledge Driven Economy, HM Government, December 1998 NO WEBLINK
ECO2	Productivity in the UK: 3 – The Regional Dimension, HM Government, November 2001 http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk
ECO3	A Safe Bet for Success – Modernising Britain’s Gambling Laws, DCMS, March 2002 http://www.culture.gov.uk/Reference_library

ECO4	Modernising Britain's Gambling Laws – Draft Gambling Bill, DCMS, July 2003 http://www.culture.gov.uk/Reference_library
ECO5	Planning for Economic Development, ODPM, May 2004 http://www.communities.gov.uk
ECO6	Historic Towns and Cities in England's Northwest, NWDA, 2005 http://www.nwda.co.uk
ECO7	The State of the North West's Economy Long Term Forecasts, NW Regional Intelligence Unit, March 2005 http://www.nwriu.co.uk
ECO8	Towards a Sustainable Employment Land Strategy: Stage 2, East Lancashire Partnership, May 2005 NO WEBLINK
ECO9	Business Forecasts Northwest, Regional Economic Forecasting Panel, December 2005 http://www.nwda.co.uk
ECO10	Northwest Regional Economic Strategy 2006 – 2009, NWDA, December 2005 http://www.nwda.co.uk
ECO11	Regional Funding Allocation, NWDA, January 2006 http://www.nwda.co.uk
ECO12	Employment Land Reviews – Guidance Note, Environmental Resources Management for ODPM, December 2004 www.communities.gov.uk
ECO13	Guide to Improving the Economic Evidence Base Supporting Regional Economic and Spatial Strategies, Ove Arup and Partners for ODPM, September 2005 Guide to Improving Economic Evidence Base
ECO14	Northwest Regional Economic Strategy 2006, NWDA, March 2006 www.nwda.co.uk
ECO15	North West Economic Baseline: Final Full Report (Part of the RES Review), Regeneris Consulting for NWDA, July 2005 www.nwda.co.uk
ECO16	Boosting Economic Growth and the Draft North West Regional Economic Strategy NO WEBLINK
ECO17	Town Centre Assessment Study, White Young Green Planning (for NWRA), 2005 WhiteYoungGreen TCA Study
ECO17a	Appendices to Town Centre Assessment Report
ECO18	Regional Employment Land Study, Arup (for NWRA) 2005, Phase 1 & 2, Appraisal Report and Phase 2A3, Final Report http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents

ENERGY

ENE1	Small-Scale Hydroelectric Generation in the UK, ETSU, 1989 NO WEBLINK
ENE2	A Review of the UK Onshore Wind Resource, ETSU, 2000 NO WEBLINK
ENE3	The Energy White Paper – Creating a Low Carbon Economy, Department of Trade & Industry, February 2003 http://www.dti.gov.uk/energy
ENE4	Strategy for the Promotion of Micro Generation and the Low Carbon Buildings Programme, Department of Trade & Industry, June 2005 http://www.dti.gov.uk
ENE5	Nuclear Decommissioning Agency Strategy – Draft for Consultation, Nuclear Decommissioning Agency, August 2005 http://www.nda.gov.uk

ENE6	Our Energy Challenge: Power from the People: Microgeneration Strategy, Department of Trade & Industry, March 2006 www.dti.gov.uk
ENE7	The Energy Challenge: The Government's report on the Energy Review, Department of Trade & Industry, July 2006 www.dti.gov.uk
ENE8	Renewable Energy Targets for the North West January 2006 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/download_file.php?id=598
ENE9	Advancing Sustainable Energy – A Sustainable Energy Strategy for the North West : Consultation Draft October 2004 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/index.php?group_id=86&mode=details&id=366
ENE10	Advancing Sustainable Energy – a Sustainable Energy Strategy for the North West. Part 1: Energy, Efficiency, Renewable and Combined Heat &Power. Consultation Draft October 2004 www.rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/download_file.php?id=329
ENE11	Nuclear Decommissioning Strategy, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority http://www.nda.gov.uk

ENVIRONMENT

ENV1	Asset Management Plan 3, 2000 – 2005, OFWAT, 1999 NO WEBLINK
ENV2	Circular 2/85: Planning Controls over Oil and Gas Operations, DOE, 1999 Replaced by ENV2A
ENV2A	Mineral Planning Guidance: On-shore Oil, Gas and Coalbed Methane Development - Draft Consultation Document, 2000 www.communities.gov.uk
ENV3	Planning for Biodiversity – Good Practice Guide, RTPI, 1999 http://www.rtpi.org.uk
ENV4	England Forestry Strategy – A New Focus for England's Woodlands, Forestry Commission, 1999 http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry
ENV5	Climate Change: Assessing the Impacts-Identifying the Responses, UKCIP & DETR, 2000 http://www.ukcip.org.uk (need to register to view)
ENV6	Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England & Scotland, Countryside Agency & Scottish Natural Heritage, 2002 http://www.countryside.gov.uk/lar
ENV7	Hadrian's Wall Management Plan 2002 – 2007, English Heritage, 2002 http://www.english-heritage.org.uk
ENV8	A New Vision for Northwest Coastal Resorts – Summary Report, NWDA, March 2003 A New Vision for Northwest Coastal Resorts, Summary Report - 2003
ENV9	Ecological Footprint of the North West, NWDA, 2004 http://www.actionforsustainability.org
ENV10	Biodiversity By Design – A Guide for Sustainable Communities, Town and Country Planning Association, 2004 www.tcpa.org.uk/downloads/TCPA
ENV11	Meeting the Sequential Flood Risk Test – Guidelines for the North West Region, NWRA/EA, July 2004 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents
ENV12	The Agenda for Growth – The Regional Forestry Framework for the North West, North West Regional Forestry Framework Partnership, 2005 http://www.iwood.org.uk/
ENV13	NOT USED

ENV14	Making Space for Water. Taking Forward a New Government Strategy for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management in England, Defra, March 2005 http://www.defra.gov.uk/environ
ENV15	Making Space for Water. Taking Forward a New Government Strategy for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management in England. First Government Response to the Autumn 2004 Making Space for Water Consultation Exercise, HM Treasury, ODPM, DfT, DEFRA, March 2006 www.defra.gov.uk/environ/fcd
ENV16	The Town and Country Planning (Green Belt) Direction 2005, ODPM, December 2005 www.communities.gov.uk
ENV17	Planning For the Protection of European Sites: Appropriate Assessment-Guidance for Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents - Amendment. DCLG, August 2006 www.communities.gov.uk
ENV18	Planning Protection of European Sites: Appropriate Assessment, DCLG, August 2006 www.communities.gov.uk
ENV19	The Conservation (Natural Habitats &C) (Amendment Regulations) 2006 [SI No 2716] http://www.defra.gov.uk
ENV20	Spatial Implications of Climate Change for the North West. June 2003 http://www.nwra.gov.uk
ENV21	Green Infrastructure Guide
ENV22	Monitoring Plan, 2000-2005, North West Water NO WEBLINK
ENV23	Regional Park Resources, Baker Associates, Countrywise Consultants & Enderby Associates, 2003 www.rpg.nwra.gov.uk

GENERAL

GEN1	Our Towns and Cities: The Future – Delivering an Urban Renaissance, DETR, November 2000 http://www.communities.gov.uk
GEN2	Planning: Delivering a Fundamental Change, DLTR, December 2001 http://odpm.gov.uk
GEN3	The Tourism Vision for England’s Northwest, NWDA, March 2003 http://www.nwda.co.uk/publications
GEN4	The Strategy for Tourism in England’s Northwest, NWDA, June 2003 Strategy for Tourism in England’s Northwest - 2005
GEN5	Shifting Sands: Design and the Changing Image of English Seaside Towns, CABE/English Heritage, 2003 http://www.cabe.org.uk
GEN6	Major Event Strategy, NWDA, 2004 http://www.nwda.co.uk
GEN7	Well Placed to Deliver? Shaping the Pattern of Government Services, St Michael Lyons, March 2004 http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/consultations_and_legislation
GEN8	Releasing Resources to the Front Line: Review of Public Sector Efficiency, Sir Peter Gershon, July 2004 http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spending_review
GEN9	Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future, ODPM, 2005 http://www.communities.gov.uk
GEN10	Securing the Future – Delivering UK Sustainable Development Strategy, Defra, March 2005 http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/publications
GEN11	The North West Best Practice Design Guide, NWRA, May 2006 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents

GEN12	Sustainable Communities: People, Places and Prosperity: A Five Year Plan from the ODPM, January 2005 www.communities.gov.uk
GEN13	Creating Sustainable Communities in the North West. The Regional Annex to, Making it Happen: The Northern Way. ODPM, January 2005 http://communities.gov.uk
GEN14	The Planning System: General Principles, ODPM, February 2005 (This document includes advice and information about the operation of the planning system that had previously been included in PPG1, updated to take account of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) www.communities.gov.uk
GEN15	Diversity and Equality in Planning: A Good Practice Guide, ODPM, March 2005 www.communities.gov.uk
GEN16	Planning Obligations, ODPM Circular 5/05 www.communities.gov.uk
GEN17	Planning Gain Supplement: A Consultation, HM Treasury, ODPM and HM Revenue and Customs, December 2005 www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media
GEN18	Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites. ODPM Circular 01/2006 www.communities.gov.uk
GEN19	Barker Review of Land Use Planning: Interim Report – Analysis, July 2006 www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media
GEN20	Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks, ODPM, November 2005 www.communities.gov.uk
GEN21	An Ageing Population. Impacts for the North West http://www.ageconcern.org.uk/AgeConcern
GEN22	Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement (DMIPSS 02/2006) Planning Health and Well-being. http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/publications
GEN23	Core Output Indicators for Regional Planning CoreOutputIndicatorsforRegionalPlanning
GEN24	The European Spatial Development Perspective (E.S.D.P) January 1999 http://www.mpptt.gov.al

HEALTH

HEA1	Health Survey for England, Department of Health, 2004 http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document
HEA2	Investment for Health: A Plan for the North West England, NW Public Health Team, GONW & Associated Action Plan, 2004 http://www.nwda.co.uk/publications
HEA3	European Cardiovascular Disease Statistics, British Heart Foundation, 2005 http://www.heartstats.org
HEA4	Health Inequalities, North West Public Health Observatory, 2005 http://www.nwpho.org.uk/information
HEA5	Better Environment Healthier People, Our Contribution to Health, Environment Agency, 2005 Environment Agency
HEA6	Choosing Activity: A Physical Activity Plan, Department of Health, March 2005 http://www.sportdevelopment.org.uk
HEA7	Delivering Choosing Health: Making Healthier Choices Easier, Department of Health, March 2005 http://www.dh.gov.uk/PublicationsAndStatistics

HOUSING

HOU1	Our Future Homes, HMSO, June 1995 http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk
HOU2	Housing in the North – A Study of Empty Homes, Northern Housing Research Partnership, 1997 http://www.northern-consortium.org.uk/rsprogrammesummary.htm
HOU3	Monitoring Provision of Housing Through the Planning System – Towards Better Practice, DETR, 2000 www.communities.gov.uk/embedded_object.asp?id=1144619
HOU4	Housing: An Effective Way to Sustain Rural Communities – Part 1: The Effects of Affordable Housing on Rural Communities, Cumbria Rural Housing Trust, 2004 http://www.crht.org.uk
HOU5	Review of Housing Supply – Delivering Stability: Securing our Future Housing Needs, HM Treasury, March 2004 http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/consultations_and_legislation/barker
HOU6	Proposals for Introducing a Code for Sustainable Homes – A Consultation Paper, ODPM, 2005 http://www.communities.gov.uk
HOU7	North West Regional Housing Strategy, NW Regional Housing Board, 2005 http://www.nwrhb.org.uk/draft.asp
HOU8	Quality and Choice: a Decent Home for All, DETR, April 2000 http://www.communities.gov.uk
HOU9	The Value for Money of Delivering Affordable Housing Through Section 106, ODPM, July 2005 http://odpm.gov.uk/index
HOU10	Housing Market Trends in the North West of England, University of Birmingham, August 2005 http://www.nwrhb.org.uk
HOU11	Delivering Housing For An Ageing Population, Housing & Older People Development Group, October 2005 http://hopdev.housingcare.org/publications
HOU12	Attracting & Retaining Families in New Urban Mixed Income Communities, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, January 2006 http://www.jrf.org.uk/KNOWLEDGE/findings/housing
HOU13	Planning and Affordable Housing: Circular 6/98 www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1144410
HOU14	The Barker Review of Housing Supply Delivering Stability: Securing our Future Housing Needs: Final Report, March 2004 http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/consultations_and_legislation/barker
HOU15	The Government’s response to Kate Barker’s Review of Housing Supply, December 2005 www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media
HOU16	Sustainable Communities: Homes for All: A Five Year Plan from the ODPM, January 2005 www.communities.gov.uk
HOU17	Letter from Mike Ash, ODPM on the Government’s Response to the Barker Review of Housing Supply, December 2005 www.gos.gov.uk/gonw/docs
HOU18	Government Response to the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee Report – Housing: Building a Sustainable Future, May 2005 www.communities.gov.uk
HOU19	Housing Market Assessments: Draft Practice Guidance, ODPM, December 2005 (Only available online) www.communities.gov.uk
HOU20	Housing Land Availability Assessments: Identifying Appropriate Land for Housing Development: Draft Practice Guidance, ODPM, December 2005 (Only available online) www.communities.gov.uk

HOU21	Interim 2002 Household Projections: By Region, 2001-2021 www.communities.gov.uk
HOU22	2003-Based Household Projections for England and the Regions to 2026 ODPM Statistical Release 2006/0042, March 2006 www.communities.gov.uk
HOU23	Land Use Change in England: Residential Development to 2005: Update July 2006, DCLG, July 2006 www.communities.gov.uk
HOU24	North West Household Growth Estimates Study. August 2006 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents
HOU25	North West Housing Markets, Ecotec, 2005 http://www.nwrhb.org.uk
HOU26	Spatial Implications of the North West Housing Renewal Pathfinder Programme March 2005 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents
HOU27	Exploring Urban Potential for Housing – The Guide 2003 www.rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents

MINERALS & WASTE

MW1	National and Regional Guidelines for Aggregates Provision in England, 2001 – 2016 www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1144267
MW2	Regional Waste Strategy for the North West, NWRA, September 2004 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/index.php?group_id=6&mode=details&id=352
MW3	A Waste Strategy for the North West – The Challenge Ahead, Banks Foundation, 2004 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/index.php?group_id=72&expand=6
MW4	RTAB Waste Management Monitoring Report 2003, NW Technical Advisory Board, 2004 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/index.php?group_id=6&mode=details&id=265
MW5	Review of England’s Waste Strategy: A Consultation Document, Defra, February 2006 (Closing date for comments: 9 May 2006) www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/wastestratereview/index.htm
MW6	Review of England’s Waste Strategy: A Consultation Document, Summary of Responses to the Consultation, DEFRA, August 2006 www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/wastestratereview/responses-summary.pdf

MONITORING

MON1	Vital Signs 2005, GONW et al, July 2006 www.gonw.gov.uk/gonw/OurRegion/VitalSigns/
MON2	Annual Monitoring Report on RPG13 (2006), NWRA, February 2006 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/index.php?group_id=136&expand=8
MON3	Annual Monitoring Report on RPG 13 (2004)
MON4	Annual Monitoring Report on RPG 13 (2003)
MON5	Feedback on Regional Annual Monitoring Reports (2005)

OTHER REGIONS

OREG1	A Heritage Strategy for the South Pennines, Standing Conference of South Pennine Authorities (SCOSPA) 2000 NO WEBLINK
OREG2	Regional Spatial Strategy: Submission Draft, VIEW: Shaping the North East, December 2004 http://www.viewnortheast.com/documents/index.aspx
OREG3	East of England Plan: Draft Revision to the RSS for the East of England www.eera.gov.uk/category.asp?cat=120&id=SXD02E-A77F5420

OREG4	East of England Plan December 2004, Report of the Panel, June 2006 www.goeast.gov.uk/goeast/planning/regional_planning/?a=42496
OREG5	RSS for the North East: Submission Draft, Draft for Public Consultation www.viewnortheast.com/documents/June05/RSSSUBMISSIONJUN05.pdf
OREG6	Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East, Panel Report, July 2006 www.northeasteip.co.uk/downloads/panel_report.pdf
OREG7	The Yorkshire and Humber Plan: Draft for Public Consultation, January 2006 www.yhassembly.gov.uk/index_library.cfm?routine=content&channel=Document%20Library
OREG8	A Clear Vision for the South East: The South East Plan Core Document, March 2006 www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/plan/view_plan.html
OREG9	Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG 9): Waste and Minerals, June 2006 www.gose.gov.uk/gose/docs/171301/311174/422586
OREG10	The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West 2006 – 2026, June 2006 www.southwest-ra.gov.uk/swra/ourwork/RSS/RSS_final_draft_version.shtml

REGIONAL

REG1	Views from the North West: The Issues, NWRA, 1999 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/planning/consulting_the_people.php
REG2	Regional Planning Guidance Review – Choices for the North West, NWRA, 1999 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/planning/consulting_the_people.php
REG3	Views from the North West: The Strategic Options, NWRA, 1999 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/planning/consulting_the_people.php
REG4	Regional Planning Guidance Review – Listening to the North West, NWRA, 1999 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/planning/consulting_the_people.php
REG5	Moving Forward the Northern Way - Summary, The Northern Way Group, September 2004 http://www.thenorthernway.co.uk/report_sept04.html
REG6	Northern Way – First Growth Strategy Report, The Northern Way Group, September 2004 www.thenorthernway.co.uk/page.asp?id=184
REG7	Strategic Regional Sites: Annual Monitoring Report, NWDA, April 2005 www.nwda.co.uk
REG8	RPG13: Current RSS for the NW, March 2003 www.gos.gov.uk/gonw/Planning/RegionalPlanning/RegionalPlanningGuidanceNW
REG9	RPG13: Partial Review 2003, Panel Report http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/index.php?group_id=81&mode=details&id=423
REG10	Letter dated 6 July 2006, from Douglas Alexander, Department of Transport, to Councillor Joyce, Chair of NWRA, Relating to Regional Funding Allocations. NO WEBLINK
REG11	The North West Plan: Draft Implementation Framework , January 2006 Draft Implementation Framework
REG12	Sustainability Appraisal of the North West Regional Spatial Strategy, January 2006 Sustainability Appraisal
REG13	The North West Plan: Submitted Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West of England – Technical Appendix, January 2006 www.nwra.gov.uk/documents
REG14	A Methodology for Determining Regional Transport Priorities in the North West (JMP Consulting for NWRA, 2006) www.nwra.gov.uk/uploads
REG15	Pre-Submission Consultation Statement, March 2006 www.nwra.co.uk/documents
REG16	Submitted Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West, January 2006 www.nwra.gov.uk/uploads

REG17	Technical Advisory Paper on the North West Spatial Strategy and Health. Final Report December 2004 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/uploads/rpg_docs/rp_li4J_Technical_Advisory_Paper_on
REG18	The North West Regional Spatial Strategy, Issues Paper, September 2004
REG19	Letter dated 9 October from NWRA to GONW, Relating to Funding Constraints – Habitats Regulations Assessment of Draft RSS Policies; letter in response from GONW to NWRA dated 27 October 2006

RURAL

RUR1	England Rural Development Plan 2000 – 2006: North West Region, Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, January 2000 http://www.defra.gov.uk/erdp/pdfs/programme/nw/northwest.pdf
RUR2	Review of the Rural White Paper; Our Countryside: The Future, DEFRA, January 2004 http://www.defra.gov.uk/rural/rwpreview/default.htm
RUR3	Farm Diversification in the North West – a Guide to Planning, NWRA, 2003 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/index.php?group_id=40&expand=102
RUR4	Rural Strategy 2004, DEFRA, 2004 http://www.defra.gov.uk/rural/strategy/default.htm
RUR5	Our Countryside: The Future – a Fair Deal for Rural England, Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, November 2000 http://www.defra.gov.uk/rural/ruralwp/whitepaper/default.htm
RUR6	State of the Rural North West Region, Pion Economics, March 2005 www.gonw.gov.uk/gonw/EnvironmentRural/RegionalRuralPolicy/StateoftheRuralNorthWest/?a=42496
RUR7	North West Regional Rural Delivery Framework, GONW and Regional Rural Partners, April 2006 www.gos.gov.uk/gonw/docs/276882/400859
RUR8	State of the Countryside 2005, Commission for Rural Communities http://www.ruralcommunities.gov.uk/article.asp?aID=56&pID=2

SPORT

SPO1	The Value of the Sports Economy in the North West, Sport England, 2000 www.sportengland.org/sporteng_nw_june03.pdf
SPO2	Game Plan, DCSM, December 2002 http://www.sportdevelopment.org.uk/html/gameplan.html
SPO3	North West on the Move – North West Plan for Sport and Physical Activity 2004-2008, Sport England North West, June 2004 http://www.sportengland.org/index/get_resources/resource_downloads/sports_plans.htm

SUB-REGIONAL

SUB1	Preston Community Strategy, Preston Strategic Partnership, 2003 http://www.prestonstrategicpartnership.org.uk/Category.asp?cat=716
SUB2	Cheshire Sub-Regional Housing Strategy 2004-2008, Cheshire Housing Alliance, 2004 www.chester.gov.uk/PDF/Sub-regional%20housing%20strategy%2000.pdf
SUB3	Sustainable Cumbria 2004 – 2024: A Strategy for Growth and Progress for Cumbria, October 2004 http://www.cumbria.gov.uk/subregionalstrategy/
SUB4	Carlisle Renaissance Prospectus, Carlisle City Council, 2005 http://www.carlisle.gov.uk/carlislecc/main.asp?page=1199

SUB5	Manchester City Region Development Programme – Accelerating the Economic Growth of the North, The Northern Way Group, June 2005 http://www.thenorthernway.co.uk/documents.html
SUB6	Liverpool City Region – Transforming Our Economy, The Northern Way Group, June 2005 http://www.thenorthernway.co.uk/downloaddoc
SUB7a	Central Lancashire City Region Development Programme, The Northern Way Group, June 2005 http://www.thenorthernway.co.uk/cityregions.html
SUB7b	Central Lancashire City Region Development Programme, City With Room to Breathe, The Northern Way Group, 2006 http://www.thenorthernway.co.uk/cityregions.html
SUB8a	The Core Central Lancashire Sub Regional Strategy, GVA Grimley (for Preston City Council, Chorley B.C & South Ribble B.C), March 2006 http://www.preston.gov.uk/General.asp?id=SX9452-A7807713&cat=34
SUB8b	The Core Central Lancashire Sub Regional Strategy - Sustainability Appraisal, GVA Grimley (for Preston City Council, Chorley B.C & South Ribble B.C), March 2006 http://www.preston.gov.uk/General.asp?id=SX9452-A7807713&cat=34
SUB8c	The Core Central Lancashire Sub Regional Strategy – Audit & Analysis Report, GVA Grimley (for Preston City Council, Chorley B.C & South Ribble B.C), March 2006 http://www.preston.gov.uk/General.asp?id=SX9452-A7807713&cat=34
SUB9a	West Cheshire/North East Wales Sub-Regional Spatial Strategy, Hyder Consulting, 2005 http://www.wda.co.uk/index.cfm/wda_home/reports_publications/west_cheshire
SUB9b	West Cheshire/North East Wales Sub-Regional Spatial Strategy, 2006 http://www.wda.co.uk/index.cfm/wda_home/reports_publications/west_cheshire

SUSTAINABILITY

SUS1	Action for Sustainability, NWRA, 2004 http://www.actionforsustainability.org/index.php
SUS2	Quality of Life Capital: Managing Environmental, Social and Economic Benefits, English Nature, Environment Agency, the Countryside Agency, March 2001 http://www.countryside.gov.uk/LAR/Landscape/Quality/overview/whatisqualityoflife.asp
SUS3	The Green Guide to Specification, BREEAM, January 2002 - NO WEBLINK
SUS4	Energy in England’s Northwest – Achieving Sustainable Growth, NWDA, July 2003 http://www.nwda.co.uk/publications
SUS5	The UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/publications/uk-strategy/index.htm

TRANSPORT

TRA1	The Future of Air Transport: White Paper, Department for Transport, December 2003 www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_aviation/documents/divisionhomepage/029650.hcsp
TRA2	The Future of Transport: White Paper, CM 6234, Department For Transport, July 2004 www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_about/documents/divisionhomepage/031259.hcsp
TRA3	Regional Spatial Strategies: Guide to Producing Regional Transport Strategies, Department For Transport, July 2006 www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_localtrans/documents/page/dft_localtrans_612196.hcsp
TRA4	NOT USED
TRA5	NW Methodology for Determining Transport Policies for RFA, Atkins, January 2006
TRA6	Park and Ride, its Role in Transport Policy, CPRE, 1998 www.cpre.org.uk/resources/pub/pdfs/transport/road-transport/park-and-ride.pdf
TRA7	Waterways for Tomorrow, DETR, 2000 http://www.defra.gov.uk/Environment/water/iw/tomorrow/index.htm

TRA8	Modern Ports: A UK Policy, DETR, November 2000 http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_shipping/documents/page/dft_shipping_505279.hcsp
TRA9	Ports Policy Review, Department for Transport, May 2006 www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_shipping/documents/divisionhomepage/611692.hcsp&&DI=174&IG=d73fe5788d144794871bbb587221f219&POS=1&CM=WPU&CE=1&CS=AWP&SR=1
TRA10	Freight on Water: A New Prospectus, Freight Study Group, 2002 www.defra.gov.uk/Environment/water/iw/freight/pdf/freight_report.pdf
TRA11	European Transport Policy for 2010: Time to Decide, European Commission, 2002 http://ec.europa.eu/transport/white_paper/index_en.htm
TRA12	Network Strategy North West Regional Brief, Highways Agency, January 2002
TRA13	Managing Our Roads, Department for Transport, 2003 www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_roads/documents/page/dft_roads_610510.pdf
TRA14	North West Freight Transport Strategy, NW Freight Advisory Group, November 2003 http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/index.php?group_id=12&mode=details&id=209
TRA15	National Travel Survey, Department for Transport, 2004 http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstats/documents/page/dft_transstats_028347.hcsp
TRA16	Port of Liverpool Handbook & Directory, Mersey Docks & Harbour Company, 2004 NO WEBLINK
TRA17	Transport in Tomorrow's Countryside, Countryside Agency, 2004 http://www.countryside.gov.uk/Publications/articles/Publication_tcm2-4328.asp
TRA18	Walking and Cycling: An Action Plan, Department for Transport, June 2004 http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_susttravel/documents/page/dft_susttravel_029200.hcsp
TRA19	Guidance on Accessibility in Local Transport Plans, Department of Transport, December 2004 http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_localtrans/documents/page/dft_localtrans_033615.hcsp
TRA20	NOT USED
TRA21	Focus on Personal Travel, Department for Transport, 2005 http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstats/documents/page/dft_transstats_037492.hcsp
TRA22	Sustainable Distribution Fund: A Single Pot for Investments in England, Department for Transport, February 2005 http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_freight/documents/page/dft_freight_035188.hcsp
TRA23	No More School Run: Proposal for a National Yellow Bus Scheme in the UK, The Sutton Trust, June 2005 www.suttontrust.com/reports/NoMoreSchoolRunFinalReport.pdf
TRA24	An Appraisal of the Consideration of Accessibility in the North West Regional Transport Strategy. Final Report - NO WEBLINK
TRA25	A Methodology for Determining Regional Transport Priorities in the North West http://rpg.nwra.gov.uk/documents/index.php?group_id=138&mode=details&id=613
TRA26	North West Ports Economic Trends and Land Use Study Final Report 19.10.05 http://www.nwda.co.uk/publications.aspx?Publications=1&area=78&subarea=81&It
TRA27	North West Regional Planning Assessment for the Railways, 2006 http://www.dft.gov.uk/

EXAMINATION DOCUMENTS

EXAM1	Original representations to the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (12 files, 738 respondents)
EXAM2	Draft List of Matters and Participants, July 2006
EXAM3	Notes for Participants, July 2006
EXAM4	Notes of the Preliminary Meeting 27 July 2006
EXAM5	Final List of Matters and Participants
EXAM6	EiP Programme
EXAM7	Core Documents List
EXAM8	Submitted Documents List
EXAM9a	Panel Questions – Matter 1
EXAM9b	Panel Questions – Matter 2
EXAM9c	Panel Questions – Matter 3
EXAM9d	Panel Questions – Matter 4

BRIEFING PAPERS

BRIEF1	Travel to Work Patterns (2001 Census). NWRA
BRIEF2	Key Service Centres and Settlement Hierarchy. NWRA
BRIEF3	Economic Scenarios. NWRA
BRIEF4	Map of flood risk areas and how they relate to development proposals. NWRA
BRIEF5	Briefing Note on West Cheshire/North East Wales Sub-Regional Strategy, and its relationship to the RSS. NWRA
BRIEF6	Note on the role and purpose of the sub-regions, their boundaries and how they have been arrived at. NWRA
BRIEF7	The pros and cons of apportioning the employment land between local authorities, and if it were to be done how might it be approached. NWRA
BRIEF8	Transport Investment Priorities
BRIEF8a	Transport Investment Priorities Appendix 1 Tables 10a – 10c
BRIEF9	Plan showing where peat is found, and its relationship to designations such as AONB and SPAs. What has been the extent of extraction over the last 10 years. NWRA
BRIEF10	Waste Management Policies in the Draft RSS – Explanation of Tables 11.3 – 11.5. NWRA
BRIEF11	Dealing with the Accommodation Needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the RSS. NWRA

BRIEF12	Work undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners – Household Projections & Migration Patterns. NWRA
BRIEF13	Work undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners – Impact of DCLG 2003 Household Projections on Household Growth Estimates Study. NWRA
BRIEF14	Key Service Centres - developing a revised policy approach. Initial NWRA reaction to the recommendations made by LUC. NWRA
BRIEF15	Table 8.2 – Provision of Sub-Regional and Local Employment Land by Sub-Region 2005-2021. NWRA
BRIEF15a	Additional Information - Table 8.2 – Provision of Sub-Regional and Local Employment Land by Sub-Region 2005-2021. NWRA
BRIEF16	Briefing Note on Retail. NWRA
BRIEF17	Regionally Significant Economic Development. NWRA
BRIEF17a	Inter-modal Freight Terminals. NWRA
BRIEF18	North West Household Growth Estimates Study – Application of Alternative Economic Activity Rates. NWRA
BRIEF19	Proposed Further Development of the Implementation Framework. NWRA
BRIEF20	Suggested Word Changes to Draft RSS. NWRA
BRIEF20a	Addendum to Suggested Wording Changes to Draft RSS NWRA
BRIEF21	Appropriate Assessment – Update Briefing Note, NWRA
BRIEF21a	Habitats Regulations Assessment Exercise Briefing
BRIEF22	Overview of Methodology for Determining Housing Provision Figures in Draft RSS. NWRA
BRIEF23	North West Regional Planning Assessment for the Railways
BRIEF24	Additional Housing Data Requested by RSS EiP Panel - Tables 1 & 2 (NWRA)
BRIEF25	Population Growth
BRIEF26	Sub-regional and Local Employment Land Requirements Table 8.2 Using Different Economic Scenarios
BRIEF27	Briefing Paper 27: West Cheshire/North East Wales - suggested changes (NWRA)
BRIEF28	Revised Suggested Wording Changes to Draft RSS
BRIEF29	Not currently allocated
BRIEF30	Sub-Regional Building Blocks (GONW)
BRIEF31	Structure and Broad Content of RSS (GONW)
BRIEF32	RSS/RES/RFA Alignment (GONW)
BRIEF33	Housing (GONW)
BRIEF34	Energy Review (GONW)

BRIEF35	Policy RDF1 and Table 7.1 (GONW)
BRIEF36	Regional Transport Strategies: Funding for Transport (GONW)
BRIEF37	Revising Table 9.1 Local Authority Area Groupings (GONW 8)
BRIEF38	Part 4 Inconsistencies (GONW 9)

DRAFT REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR THE NORTH WEST

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

SUBMITTED DOCUMENT LIST

Email: secretariat@northwesteip.co.uk

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/01	The Greater Manchester Forecasting Model (GMFM): Summary
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/02	The Greater Manchester Forecasting Model: Introduction
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/03	The Greater Manchester Forecasting Model: Summary Guide to the Methodology
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/04	The Greater Manchester Forecasting Model: The Use of the Model to Inform the Sub- and City Regional Strategy in the Manchester City Region
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/05	The Greater Manchester Forecasting Model: Outputs for Greater Manchester
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/06	The Greater Manchester Forecasting Model: RSS Economic Assumptions - AGMA's Comments
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/07	North West Region Sub-Regional Forecasts from GMFM
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/08	GMFM Appendix 1 - Greater Manchester/Manchester City Region "Accelerated Growth Scenario": Assumptions.
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/09	Releasing the National Economic Potential of Provincial City Regions
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/10	A Framework for City Regions
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/11	Northern Way Growth Strategy : City Regions Economic Analysis, September 2004
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/12	A Framework for City Regions - Working Paper 1 Mapping City Regions
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/13	Strengthening the Evidence Base of Key Economic and Spatial Strategies in the North West SURF/CUPS/IPEG (Universities of Salford and Manchester) for NWDA, 2006
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/14	Manchester Enterprises : Demand for Employment Land in Greater Manchester
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/15	Policy RTA: Integrated Transport Networks in the North West
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/16	Manchester City Region Sub Regional Statement context Strategic Framework and Details Policies, September 2005
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/17	Manchester City Region Spatial Strategy
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/18	Town and Country Planning Association and Renewable Energy Association Conference
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/19	Regional Public Transport Framework
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/20	Application to DFT TIF Pump Priming Round 1
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/21	Letter to the North West Regional Assembly and RDA
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/22	The Harlow Green Spaces Project : Green Infrastructure Plan
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/23	Countryside Agency : The Countryside In and Around Towns (July 2006)
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/24	North West Green Infrastructure Guide (Consultation Draft)
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/25	Indicative Content of Revised Policy EM 1/3 Combined
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/26	RSS Policy Development Template
AGMA	SDL/AGMA/27	Policy W2 Regionally Significant Employment Development
BHHPA	SDL/BHHPA/01	STEAM Report 2004
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/01	Building the Department for Communities and Local Government
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/02	Viewpoints of Social Exclusion in the East Midlands
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/03	Healthy Sustainable Communities

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/04	People Making the Difference
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/05	Faith and Community : A Good Practice Guide for Local Authorities
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/06	Working Together : Cooperation Between Government and Faith Communities
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/07	Not Seen Not Heard. Social Exclusion in Rural Areas
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/08	Faith in England's North West 2005
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/09	Faith in England's North West 2003
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/10	Faith in England's North West : Economic Impact Assessment
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/11	Halton Housing Needs Study Final Report 2006
Brethren Gospel Trust	SDL/BGT/12	Creating Sustainable Communities
Chester City Council	SDL/CHCC/01	Housing Needs Survey
Chester City Council	SDL/CHCC/02	Investing in Success
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/01	Site Allocations Development Plan Document (preferred option)
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/02	Congleton Borough Housing Needs Survey. Final Report 2004
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/03	Housing Land Availability Schedule 31 March 2006
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/04	Employment Land Availability Schedule 31 March 2006
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/05	Urban Potential Study
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/06	Local Development Framework : Annual Monitoring Report
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/07	Corporate Strategy and Performance Plan 2006/2007
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/08	Replacement Structure Plan : Annual Monitoring Report 2004/2005
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/09	Community Strategy 2006-2016 (draft)
Congleton BC	SDL/CONBC/10	Making Housing Count in the Manchester Region: Spatial Focus Report and Reference Area (Final Report)
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/01	Sustaining the Economy and a High Quality of Life in North West England
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/02	"Analysis of Regional Investment Sites and Mersey Belt Sites", White Young Green, May 2002
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/03	What You Measure Matters
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/04	On the Right Path
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/05	The Economics of Aviation : A North West England Perspective
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/06	Indicators of Sustainable Development
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/07	Making Sense of Environmental Capacity
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/08	Analysis of Household Waste Composition and Factors Driving Waste Increases
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/09	Town Centre Assessment Study 2005 (White Young Green Consultants, Final Report, 2006)
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/10	European Landscape Convention
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/11	Extract from Cheshire Structure Plan, Explanatory Memorandum 1992
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/12	Beyond Transport Infrastructure

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/13	Landscape Sensitivity to Wind Energy Development in Lancashire
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/14	Response to the Public Consultation on the West Cheshire/North East Wales Sub Regional Spatial Strategy and Sustainability Report, CPRE, February 2006
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/15	Scoring Criteria for the Assessment of Proposed Sites for Multi Modal Freight Terminals
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/16	Useless Old Houses, CPRE, March 2004
CPRE	SDL/CPRE/17	Transport Solutions for Lancaster and Morecambe – Heysham M6 Link Northern Route, March 2002
Crewe & Nantwich BC	SDL/CNBC/1	Skills Planning For the South East Quadrant, June 2005
Crewe & Nantwich BC	SDL/CNBC/2	Private Sector House Condition Survey 2005, Final Report (March 2006)
Crewe & Nantwich BC	SDL/CNBC/3	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Housing Needs Survey, Final Report, 2006
Crewe & Nantwich BC	SDL/CNBC/4	The English Indices of Deprivation 2004 (Revised)
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/26	Planning Cumbria Technical Paper 1
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/27	Planning Cumbria Technical Paper 2
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/28	Planning Cumbria Technical Paper 3
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/29	Planning Cumbria Technical Paper 4
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/30	Technical Paper 5 : Landscape character
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/31	Technical Paper 6 : Planning for renewable development in Cumbria
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/32	Technical Paper 7 : Monitoring and Implementation
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/33	An Economic Assessment of Cumbria 2004
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/34	Employment Land Availability Schedules March 2004
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/35	Extract from the Cumbria Sub Regional Economic Action Plan - NWRA (Aug2006) Current State of Cumbria Economy
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/36	Cumbria's Sub-regional Spatial Strategy
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/37	Population Projections Chelmer Model
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/38	Recent Changes in Cumbria's Population
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/39	Chelmer Model Summary Outputs
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/40	Examining Affordability of Houses in Cumbria Using Street Value and Paycheck
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/41	Cumbria Strategy
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/42	South Lakeland Housing Needs and Market Assessment, Executive Summary June 2006
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/43	Housing Markets Preparing for Change
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/44	DTI Energy Review Consultation Document
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/45	Energy Review and Nuclear Framework
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/46	A Prospectus for Change
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/47	Household Projections and Migration Patterns : North West Assembly Report
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/48	Impact of DCLG Household Projections on Household Growth Estimates Study

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/49	Employment Land and Premises Sstudy
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/50	Landscape Capacity Assessment (part 2)
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/51	Spatial Distribution Map
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/52	Local Transport Plan 2006-11
Cumbria County Council	SDL/CUCC/53	Cumbria Economic Bulletin (CRED/UCLAN and Cumbria Economic Intelligence Partnership, September 2006)
Environment Agency	SDL/EA/01	Environmental Impacts of Housing Growth in the North West - Nov 2005
Environment Agency	SDL/EA/02	Environmental Agency Flood Risk Ranking for the North West - a Report to Support the Production of a Regional Flood Risk Assessment
Environment Agency	SDL/EA/03	Environmental Assessment of Policy Groupings and Response to Assessment of Sustainability Appraisal Report. (SAR)
Environment Agency	SDL/EA/04	Draft Report into the Water Resources Implications of Draft RSS 31-05096
Environment Agency	SDL/EA/05	Environment Agency Comments on the North West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) of LSE under the Habitats Regulations 27/09/06
Environment Agency	SDL/EA/06	Draft report into Wastewater Treatment Implications of RSS - September 2006
Environment Agency	SDL/EA/07	Apportionment of District Housing Allocations Within RSS to Individual Development Locations Within the North West
Environment Agency	SDL/EA/08	The Location of Future Waste Management Facilities in the North West
FOE NW	SDL/FOENW/01	Tackling Climate Change Through Planning : The Governments Objectives
FOE NW	SDL/FOENW/02	Friends of the Earth Commentary on the UK Sustainable Development Strategy
FOE NW	SDL/FOENW/03	The Northern Way Growth Strategy : a Comment from Friends of the Earth
Friends of The Peak District	SDL/FPD/02	North East Counting Consumption
Friends of The Peak District	SDL/FPD/03	Securing the Regions' Future
Friends of The Peak District	SDL/FPD/01	Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands
Friends of The Peak District	SDL/FPD/04	Regional Planning System : Northern Way
GONW	SDL/GONW/01	Interim Draft RSS, NWRA, Oct 2005
GONW	SDL/GONW/02	North West Household Growth Estimates Study, Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners for NWRA, August 2005
GONW	SDL/GONW/03	Study into the Identification and Use of Local Housing Market Areas for the Development of the Regional Spatial Strategy in the North West Ecotec 2006
GONW	SDL/GONW/04	Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and Council “on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment” (‘The SEA Directive’)
GONW	SDL/GONW/05	European Directive 92/43/EEC Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wildfowl and Flora (Habitats Directive)
GONW	SDL/GONW/06	Rising to the Challenge: A Climate Change Action Plan for England’s Northwest. Consultation Draft, June 2006
GONW	SDL/GONW/07	Rural Services Review, DEFRA, 2006
GONW	SDL/GONW/08	The Strategy for Sustainable Farming and Food, DEFRA, December 2002
GONW	SDL/GONW/09	NW Rural Social and Community Programme 2006
GONW	SDL/GONW/10	Access to Services (Rural Innovation, commissioned for GONW, 2006)

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
GONW	SDL/GONW/11	Water Framework Directive
GONW	SDL/GONW/12	Employment Land Study, ARUP for NWRA, June 2005
GONW	SDL/GONW/13	Gambling Act 2005
GONW	SDL/GONW/14	16 December 2004 Statement of National Policy on Casinos
GONW	SDL/GONW/15	North West Annual Statement of Learning and Skills Priorities 2006-07 (December 2005)
GONW	SDL/GONW/16	UK Biodiversity Action Plan
GONW	SDL/GONW/17	Water Act 2003
GONW	SDL/GONW/18	Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive
GONW	SDL/GONW/19	Landfill Directive
GONW	SDL/GONW/20	Waste Strategy 2000, May 2000: National Waste Strategy
GONW	SDL/GONW/21	Waste Framework Directive
GONW	SDL/GONW/22	Climate Change the UK Programme 2006, HM Government
GONW	SDL/GONW/23	NW Sustainable Energy Strategy
GONW	SDL/GONW/24	Manchester City Region Development Programme 2006
GONW	SDL/GONW/25	West Cheshire/NE Wales Sub-Regional Strategy
GONW	SDL/GONW/26	Consultation Draft August 2006 – “The City with Room to Breathe”
GONW	SDL/GONW/27	SURF 2006 – “Strengthening the Evidence Base of Key Economic and Spatial Strategies on the North West”
GONW	SDL/GONW/28	A Vision for the Lake District National Park to 2030
GONW	SDL/GONW/29	Regional Spatial Strategy Monitoring Guidance
GONW	SDL/GONW/30	Devolving decision making: 3 – Meeting the Regional Economic Challenge: The Importance of Cities to Regional Growth HM Treasury, DTI and ODPM, March 2006
GONW	SDL/GONW/31	Managing our Radioactive Waste Safely: CoRWM’s Recommendations to Government’, Committee on Radioactive Waste Management report – July 2006
GONW	SDL/GONW/32	The Planning Response to Climate Change, ODPM, September 2004
Highways Agency	SDL/HA/01	Highways Agency Technical Note: Accessibility Mapping and Network Stress (Final)
Kirkby Stephen PC/Upper Eden CPG	SDL/KSUE/1	Upper Eden Community Plan Household Survey: Initial Analysis and Summary, 2006
Kirkby Stephen PC/Upper Eden CPG	SDL/KSUE/2	Upper Eden Community Plan Household Survey: Business Telephone Survey 2006
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/1	Sustainability Appraisal of the First Detailed Proposals (Lancashire County Council, 2005)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/10	Strategic Regional Sites. Evidence Base and Emerging Issues (NWDA, January 2005)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/11	Lancashire Structure Plan 1991 – 2006 (Lancashire County Council, Feb. 1997)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/12	Town Centre Assessment Study 2005 (White Young Green Consultants, 2005)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/13	Skelmersdale Town Centre Mixed Use Development Site (Chestertons, April 2002)

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/14	Blackpool Masterplan
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/15	Preston Economic Regeneration Strategy and Action Plan : Final Report
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/16	Elevate Transformational Agenda
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/17	Joint Lancashire Structure Plan 2001-2016 Examination in Public Report of the Panel (March 2004)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/18	Joint Lancashire Structure Plan Monitoring Report 9 (Joint Structure Plan Authorities, March 2006)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/19	Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and Humber
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/02	New Projections of Households for England and the Regions in 2025 (ONS, March 2006)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/20	Lancashire Local Transport Plan Volume 1 : Our Plans ; Lancashire Local Transport Plan Volume 2 : Volume 2 : Our Strategy
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/21	Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations (DCLG, 2005)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/22	Landscape and Heritage SPG (Joint Structure Plan Authorities, 2006)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/23	Local Sites: Guidance on their Identification, Selection and Management (Defra, 2006)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/24	Lancashire Woodland Vision 2006-2015 (Lancashire County Council, 2006)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/25	North West Joint Character Area Map
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/26	Green Infrastructure Guide for the North West (NWR, 2006)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/27	Waste management Technical Report (NWR, 2001)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/28	Integrating Renewable Energy into New Developments: Toolkit for Planners, Developers and Consultants (London Renewables, 2004)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/29	Using the Merton Rule. Report of the a TCPA survey of Local Authority Planning Departments in England (TCPA, 2006)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/03	Regional Funding Allocations: the Advice of the North West Region (NWR, January 2006)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/30	Written Ministerial Statement 8 th June 2006 (DCLG, 2006)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/31	Revision 2020 : SW Renewable Electricity, Heat and On Site Generation Targets for 2020
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/32	Masterplan for Salmesbury (BAe)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/33	The Transformational Agenda: Housing Market Renewal in East Lancashire Scheme Update 2006-2019 (Elevate, 2005)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/34	Central Lancashire City Region. Sub-Regional Strategy First Detailed Proposals (LCC, Blackburn BC and Blackpool BC, 2005)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/35	Guidance on Changes to the Development control system, Circular 01/2006
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/04	Central Lancashire City Region Development Programme (Lancashire Economic Partnership, 2005)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/05	The Regional Sustainable Development Framework in the North West (Action for Sustainability, 2004)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/06	Making the Connections: Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/07	Co-ordinating Action in Rural Lancashire – The Lancashire Rural Strategy
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/08	Audit of Rural Workspace (NWR, June 2003)
Lancashire County Council	SDL/LACC/09	Enterprise Research Project (Lancashire Rural Delivery Pathfinder, June 2006)
LDNPA	SDL/LDNP/01	Lake District Economic Futures Study response by LDNPA
Liverpool City Council	SDL/LICC/01	The Local Transport for Merseyside 2006-11

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
Manchester Airport	SDL/MAN/01	The North West's Strategic Transport Priorities
Manchester Airport	SDL/MAN/02	Environment Plan
Manchester Airport	SDL/MAN/03	Draft Land Use Plan
Manchester Airport	SDL/MAN/04	Draft Master Plan to 2030 Summary
Manchester Airport	SDL/MAN/05	Draft Master Plan to 2030
Manchester Airport	SDL/MAN/06	Ground Transport Strategy
Manchester Airport	SDL/MAN/07	Draft Community Plan
Manchester City Council	SDL/MCC/01	Casino Advisory Panel Framework
Manchester City Council	SDL/MCC/02	European Cities Monitoring 2006
Manchester City Council	SDL/MCC/03	State of the English Cities Volume 1
Manchester City Council	SDL/MCC/04	State of the English Cities Volume 2
Manchester City Council	SDL/MCC/05	A Proposal to License a Regional Casino at Sport City, Manchester
Manchester City Council	SDL/MCC/06	Britain's Best Cities 2005-2006 (Exec Summary) (was numbered MCC/1 by MCC)
Maro Developments/NJW Developments/Redrow Homes NW	SDL/MAR/01	Assessment of the draft RSS Employment Land Requirements on Merseyside and Halton
Merseyside Policy Unit	SDL/MPU/01	Development of North West Competitiveness : Operational Programme 2007-13
Merseyside Policy Unit	SDL/MPU/04	Government Circular : Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
Merseyside Policy Unit	SDL/MPU/05	Local Sites: Guidance on their Identification, Selection and Management (Defra, 2006)
Merseyside Policy Unit	SDL/MPU/06	Waste Strategy 2000
Merseyside Policy Unit	SDL/MPU/07	Landfill Directive Regulatory Guidance Notes
Merseyside Policy Unit	SDL/MPU/08	European Council Directive 31999L0031
National Trust	SDL/NT/1	Blue Skies: Air Travel Demand and Tourism
Natural England	SDL/NE/1	North West Green Infrastructure Guide (Draft)
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/01	Anticipating the Impact of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/02	DCLG Making the System Work Better : Planning at Regional and Local Levels
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/03	Core Output Indications for Regional Planning
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/04	RSS Interim Working Draft - Sustainability Appraisal
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/05	Starting out with Local Development Schemes
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/06	Crime and Disorder Act 1998
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/07	Prevention of Crime and Disorder Act 1998
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/08	Local Government Act 2000
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/09	Terrorism Act 2000

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/10	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/11	Sustainable Communities in the North West Building for the Future
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/12	Local Quality of Life Indicators - Supporting Local Communities to Become Sustainable
North West Police Forces	SDL/NWPOL/13	Safer Places : The Planning System and Crime Prevention
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/CPRE/02	Draft RPG for the North West
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/01	Alternative Economic Scenarios for the Liverpool City Region, Cambridge Econometrics, July 2005
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/02	RSS Sustainability Appraisal: Interim Report on Compliance, Entec, 2005
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/03	Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the North West – Public Examination – Report of the Panel July 2001
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/04	Towards a Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West, NWRA, November 2005
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/05	Government Office North West, Comments on Emerging RSS, GONW, 2005
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/06	RSS Strategic Options Papers, NWRA, April 2005
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/07	RSS Project Plan – Final Version, NWRA, April 2005
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/08	Strengthening the Evidence Base of Key Economic and Spatial Strategies in the North West SURF/CUPS/IPEG (Universities of Salford and Manchester) for NWDA, 2006
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/09	Key Service Centres – Role and Function Study prepared by Land Use Consultants for North West Regional Assembly, 2006
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/10	Impact of DCLG 2003 Household Projections on Household Growth Estimates Study”, Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners, September 2006
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/11	Household Projections & Migration Patterns, Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners, August 2006
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/12	Regional Planning Guidance Annual Monitoring Report, NWRA, 2004
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/13	Annual Monitoring Report on RPG13, NWRA, 2005
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/14	Feedback on Regional Annual Monitoring Reports for 2005, DCLG, September 2006
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/15	Regional Technical Advisory Board, Annual Monitoring Report 2005
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/16	Implementation Plans for Regional Spatial Strategies; Advice to Regional Assemblies – Final Draft, MVA Consultancy, July 2006
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/17	Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 2203 - The Town and Country Planning (Regional Planning) (England) Regulations 2004
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/18	Business Monitor MA4: Foreign Direct Investment 2004, Office for National Statistics, January 2006 (page 83)
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/19	The North West Regional Rural Delivery Framework, GONW, April 2006
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/20	Inward Investment in the North West: Player or Pretender? DTZ Piedad Consulting, June 2005 (page 3)
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/21	RSS – Health – Notes for Policy Authors, Entec, for North West Regional Assembly, 10th September 2005
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/22	Draft Green Infrastructure Guide for the North West, NWRA et al, 2006
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/23	Flood Risk Ranking for the North West Region Report, Environment Agency, 2006
North West Regional Assembly	SDL/NWRA/24	Water Resources Implications of RSS, Environment Agency and United Utilities, 2006
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/01	HOC Hansard answer from Richard Caborn 20th March 2006

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/02	HOC Hansard answer from Richard Caborn 13th June 2006
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/03	UK Inward Investment 2005/06
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/04	Cheshire Property Market Assessment
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/05	Building on Success (Cheshire and Warrington Economic Report 2006)
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/06	Inward Investment in the North West
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/07	Cheshire Property Market Assessment 2005
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/08	Business Monitor MA4 :Foreign Direct Investment
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/09	Regional Futures England's Region's in 2030
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/10	Strengthening the Evidence-Base of Key Economic and Spatial Strategies in the North West, September 2006
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/11	Strategic Regional Sites. Evidence Base and Emerging Issues (NWDA, January 2005)
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/12	Lake District Economic Futures Study : Final Stage 1 Report
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/13	Lake District Economic Futures Study : Final Stage 2 Report : The Way Forward
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/14	Lake District Economic Futures Policy Statement
North West Regional Development Agency	SDL/NWDA/15	North West Ports : Economic Trends and Land Use Study
North West TAR	SDL/NWTAR/01	Action for Sustainability
North West TAR	SDL/NWTAR/02	The Integration of Regional Transport Strategies with Spatial Planning Policies
North West TAR	SDL/NWTAR/03	Demand Management : a Review
North West TAR	SDL/NWTAR/04	Less Traffic Where People Live : How Local Transport Schemes Can Help Cut Traffic
North West TAR	SDL/NWTAR/05	Freight and Sustainability
North West TAR	SDL/NWTAR/06	Transport and the Economy : Full Report (SACTRA)

Organisation Submitting Document	Reference	Document Submitted
North West TAR	SDL/NWTAR/07	Rebuttal To and Comments on the Draft Master Plan to 2030 for Blackpool Airport
North West TAR	SDL/NWTAR/08	Rebuttal To and comments on Manchester Airports Draft Master Plan and Four Action Plans to 2030
North West TAR	SDL/NWTAR/09	Town Centre Assessment Study, White Young Green, June 2005,
Oldham and Rochdale Pathfinder	SDL/ORP/1	Oldham and Rochdale Economic Analysis and Spatial Framework - Final Report Executive Summary January 2006
Oldham and Rochdale Pathfinder	SDL/ORP/2	Oldham and Rochdale Economic Analysis and Spatial Framework - Final Report (Main Document) January 2006
Parkside Action Group	SDL/PAG/01	Inspectors Report Into Objections to the Proposed Modifications to the St Helens Unitary Development Plan
Parkside Action Group	SDL/PAG/02	Secretary of State Decision 2002 - Motorway Service Stations M6
Parkside Action Group	SDL/PAG/03	Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy March 2004
Parkside Action Group	SDL/PAG/04	West Midlands Regional - Regional Planning Body
Parkside Action Group	SDL/PAG/05	Freight Transport Association and Rail Freight Group Forecasts for Future Demands for Rail Freight 2005
Peel Holdings	SDL/PEEL/01	John Lennon Airport Bus Service Document
Peel Holdings	SDL/PEEL/02	Guidance on Air Transport Forums and Airport Surface Strategies
Peel Holdings	SDL/PEEL/03	Recognising the Significance of the Merseyports to the North West and the UK
Peel Holdings	SDL/PEEL/04	The Future of Air Travel in Liverpool to 2030
Peel Holdings	SDL/PEEL/05	Draft Airport Master Plan to 2030 (Liverpool John Lennon Airport)
South Lakeland District Council	SDL/SLDC/2	Employment Land and Premises Study Final Report, 2005
South Lakeland District Council	SDL/SLDC/3	South Lakeland Housing Needs and Market Assessment Final Report 2006
South Lakeland District Council	SDL/SLDC/4	Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan 2001-2016 Technical Paper 2 - Key Service Centres Methodology
Viridor	SDL/VIR/1	Joint Ministerial Statement by Ben Bradshaw, Parliament Under Secretary for the Local Environment, and Yvete Cooper, the Minister for Housing and Planning, on Sustainable Waste Management, 2005
Viridor	SDL/VIR/2	Waste Strategy 2000 Part 1 (England and Wales) as amended by 21/07/05 Joint Ministerial Statement
Warrington BC	SDL/WBC/01	Supplementary Planning Guidance - Restricting the Housing Supply
Warrington BC	SDL/WBC/02	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 : 1st Annual Monitoring Report
Warrington BC	SDL/WBC/03	Housing Land Report 2006

Documents Submitted During the Course of the EiP (bold type indicates new document)

Organisation	Ref	Document Submitted
AGMA	EiP/AGMA/1	Overall Approach (Matter 1D(iii)) Explanatory Notes
AGMA	EiP/AGMA/2	Freight - Route Utilisation Strategy Draft for Consultation September 2006
AGMA	EiP/AGMA/3	People, Places, Futures - The Wales Spatial plan
AGMA	EiP/AGMA/4	Further Suggested Word Changes by AGMA (531) to the Suggested Changes to Policy Wording set out in NWRA's Briefing Paper 20
AGMA	EiP/AGMA/5	Suggested Substantive Policy Changes to Draft RSS Chapter 10 (Transport in the North West – Connecting People and Changes)
AGMA	EiP/AGMA/6	Control of Car Parking In Greater Manchester (Matter 5B)
AGMA	EiP/AGMA/7	Analysis of RTS Policies in Other Policy Areas
AGMA	EiP/AGMA/8	Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan 2 (2006/7 - 2010/11)
AGMA	EiP/AGMA/9	Suggested Additional Wording For MCR2
Blackpool Council	EiP/BC/1	The Blackpool Shopping Study 2004 - 2016
Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen Borough Councils	EiP/BCBW/1	Sustainable Catchment Areas Assessment, 2006
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/1	Saving Tranquil Places - How to Protect and Promote a Vital Asset (CPRE)
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/2	Tranquility and Regional Assemblies (CPRE)
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/3	Tranquility Map
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/4	Draft proposal from CPRE re: Panel Question 3 Matter 2C(ii)
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/5	Travel to Work Plans
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/6	Response to Panel Question Matter 6A i/ii (6) Green Infrastructure
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/7	Suggested Amendments to Policies L4 and L5 (CPRE and NWEL)

Organisation	Ref	Document Submitted
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/8	CPRE Suggestion for Paragraph to be Included in Supporting Text of EM3, in Response to Panel Question 6, Matter 6A.
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/9	Additional Bullet Point for Policy W2 (West Cheshire/North East Wales Sub-Regional Strategy)
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	EiP/CPRE/10	Proposed Amendments to Policy CNL1 (as amended by NWRA)
Cheshire Association of Local Councils	EiP/CHALC/1	Map - Our Polluted Country, 2003
Cheshire County Council	EiP/CCC/1	Cheshire County Council, Lancashire County Council, Cumbria County Council, et al : Suggested Rewording of EM1 (Matter 6A)
Copeland Borough Council	EiP/COPE/1	West Cumbria Spatial Masterplan - Schedule of Comments on NW RSS/Executive Summary
Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	EiP/CNBC/1	Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report 2006
Cumbria Association of Local Councils	EiP/CUALC/1	Strong and Prosperous Communities (Local Government White Paper) - Volume 1
Cumbria Association of Local Councils	EiP/CUALC/2	Strong and Prosperous Communities (Local Government White Paper) - Volume 2
Cumbria Association of Local Councils	EiP/CUALC/3	Strong and Prosperous Communities (Local Government White Paper) - Summary
Environment Agency	EiP/EA/01	Water Infrastructure Capacity (re: matter 6B)
English Heritage	EiP/EH/1	English Heritage and National Trust - Suggested Changes to Policy EM1c (Matter 6A)
Panel	EiP/EXAM/1	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (weblink only - www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2004/20040005.htm)
Government Office for the North West	EiP/GONW/1	Cover Letter - Publication of PPS3 (Housing)
Government Office for the North West	EiP/GONW/2	Green Belt
Government Office for the North West	EiP/GONW/3	Further Information on
Government Office for the North West	EiP/GONW/4	Letter From GONW To NWRA Regarding Appropriate Assessment (Dated 27 October 2006)
Government Office for the North West	EiP/GONW/5	Note to Panel Regarding Greenbelts
Government Office for the North West	EiP/GONW/6	Housing Information Submitted by Local Authorities to GONW
Government Office for the North West	EiP/GONW/7	Note Regarding Housing Figures Information
Highways Agency	EiP/HA/1	Trunk Road Categories/Trans European Road Networks

Organisation	Ref	Document Submitted
Highways Agency	EiP/HA/2	Trans European Transport Network Outline Plan (Map)
Highways Agency	EiP/HA/3	Network Stress (Highways Agency v Eddington Report)
Joint Response	EiP/JOINT/1	Joint Additional Submission Matter 1 E Sustainability (EA, NWEL, AGMA, CPRE, FOE, NWTAR, ChALC)
Lancashire County Council	EiP/LCC/1	Travel to Work Maps (CLCR)
Lancashire County Council	EiP/LCC/2	Proposed Amendment to Policy CLCR1
Lake District National Park Authority	EiP/LDNP/1	Rewording of Policy EM1
Lake District National Park Authority	EiP/LDNP/2	Policy CNL3 - Overall Spatial Policy for the Lake District
Manchester Airport	EiP/MAN/1	Future of Air Transport Progress Report
Manchester Airport	EiP/MAN/1a	Annex - Future of Air Transport Progress Report
Macclesfield BC	EiP/MBC/1	Comments on EiP/NWRA/10 - Operational Aviation Related Activities
Manchester City Council	EiP/MCC/1	Rewording of Policy W8
Manchester City Council	EiP/MCC/2	Final Report of Casino Advisory Panel and Accompanying Letter
MPU	EiP/MPU/1	Matter 8A LCR Policies
MPU	EiP/MPU/2	Matter 8B LCR Housing Policies
Natural England	EiP/NE/1	Suggested Rewording of EM3 and Supporting Text
Natural England	EiP/NE/2	Letter from English Nature on Behalf of Natural England to Environment Agency Regarding Appropriate Assessment
New East Manchester	EiP/NEM/1	The Economic Impact of a Regional Casino in Blackpool; a Review of the Evidence Base
North West Development Agency	EiP/NWDA/1	Priority Schemes Map and Cover Sheet
North West Environment Link	EiP/NWEL/1	Suggested Rewording of the First Section of DP1 to Clarify its Intentions, as Proposed by NWEL in the Discussion of Matter 1B
North West Environment Link	EiP/NWEL/2	Wording Changes (Matter 9)
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/1	NWRA Opening Statement to Draft RSS Examination in Public
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/2	NWRA Suggested Strategic Principles and Objectives - Transport (Matter 1D (iii))
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/3	Building a Better Future: North West Sustainability Checklist for Developments (version 1)
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/4	Joint Additional Submission Matter 1 E Sustainability - Response of the NWRA
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/5	NWRA Accessibility Study October 2006 (Report)

Organisation	Ref	Document Submitted
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/5A	NWRA Accessibility Study October 2006 (Appendices)
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/6	Clarification of Proposed Amendment to Briefing Paper 20a
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/7	Suggested Changes to Policy EM1
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/8	Statement Regarding Policy SD4
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/9	Response to Panel on Table 11.5
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/10	Definition of Operational (Airports)
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/11	Advice Note - Wording: Draft NW RSS
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/12	Advice Note To Address Inconsistency Between Installed Capacity of Renewable Energy Schemes Figures in RSS (323 MW - table 8.3 of the TA) and the NW Sustainable Energy Strategy (228 MW - page 31)
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/13	Additional Wording Policy RT7 and RT5
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/14	NWRA Response to GONW BP 9
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/15	Route Utilisation Strategy Programme (map)
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/16	NWRA Notes - Matter 7
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/17	NWRA Notes - Matter 8
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/18	Network Rail - Future Investment Programme
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/19	NWRA Changes in Response to the Panel Regarding Briefing Paper 20a
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/20	Panel Question 6B (ii) - Proximity Principle and Self Sufficiency
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/21	NWRA Suggested Amendments Policy EM17
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/22	NWRA Suggested Amendments Policy EM16 - CHECK!!!!
North West Regional Assembly	EiP/NWRA/23	Errors and Corrections to Draft RSS
Peel Holdings	EiP/PEEL/1	Merseyside Green Belt Study - Final Report (White Young Green for NWRA)
Peel Holdings	EiP/PEEL/2	John Lennon Airport Masterplan
Pendle Borough Council	EiP/PEND/1	Pendle - Submitted RSS Figures and Affordable Housing Needs
Preston/South Ribble/Chorley	EiP/PSRC/1	Suggested Policy Wording by Preston, South Ribble and Chorley
Preston/South Ribble/Chorley	EiP/PSRC/2	Amended Suggested changes to CLCR2, If Suggested Additional Policy Not Included
St Helens Borough Council	EiP/SHBC/1	Response to NWRS Briefing Paper 15a
Sport England	EiP/SP/1	Letter to NWRA Regarding Consideration of Sport and Physical Activity in Draft NW RSS

Organisation	Ref	Document Submitted
Vale Royal Borough Council	EiP/VRBC/1	Amendments to Briefing Paper 24
Warrington Borough Council	EiP/WBC/1	Corrected Supply Figures (tables 4.13 and 4.14)
Waste Planning Authorities	EiP/WPA/1	Waste Planning Authorities Suggested Wording Changes to Briefing Paper 20
Waste Planning Authorities	EiP/WPA/2	A Joint Written Submission to the Panel's Further Questions by Cumbria, Greater Manchester, Lancashire, Merseyside, and Warrington Waste Planning Authorities

Appendix E Abbreviations

AfS	Action for Sustainability
AGMA	Association of Greater Manchester Authorities
AMP	Airport Master Plan
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BREEAM	Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method
CAP	Casino Advisory Panel
CHP	Combined Heat & Power
CLCR	Central Lancashire City Region
JSP	Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan
CLG	Communities & Local Government
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CPRE	Campaign to Protect Rural England
CRDP	City Region Development Plan
DNO	Distribution Network Operators
Dpha	Dwellings per Hectare
EA	Environment Agency
EDZ	Economic Development Zone
EiP	Examination in Public
ERN	English Regions' Network
FoE	Friends of the Earth
GI	Green Infrastructure
GMFM	Greater Manchester Forecasting Model
GONW	Government Office for the North West
GPDO	General Permitted Development Order
GVA	Gross Value Added
HBF	Home Builders Federation
HMA/HMAs	Housing Market Area/Areas
HMRA	Housing Market Renewal Area
KSC	Key Service Centre
LCC	Lancashire City Council
LCR	Liverpool City Region
LDD	Local Development Document
LDNP	Lake District National Park
LDF	Local Development Framework
LPAs	Local Planning Authorities
LUC	Land Use Consultants
MCR	Manchester City Region
MCRSS	Manchester City Region Spatial Strategy

Mppa	Million passengers per annum
MPU	Merseyside Policy Unit
NRL	Npower Renewables Ltd
NWDA	North West Regional Development Agency
NWEL	North West Environment Link
NWGS	Northern Way Growth Strategy
NWRA	North West Regional Assembly
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
PDL	Previously Developed Land
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
PSA	Public Service Agreement
RES	Regional Economic Strategy
RFA	Regional Funding Allocation
RFRA	Regional Flood Risk Appraisal
RHS	Regional Housing Strategy
RPA	Regeneration Priority Areas
RPB	Regional Planning Board
RPG13	Regional Planning Guidance for the North West, March 2003
RRDF	Regional Rural Delivery Framework
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
RTS	Regional Transport Strategy
RWS	Regional Waste Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SUDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage System
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SEMMS	South East Manchester Multi-Modal Study
SIA	Strategic Investment Area
SPA	Special Protection Area
SURF	The Centre for Sustainable Urban & Regional Futures - University of Salford
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
URC	Urban Regeneration Company

Appendix F Addendum Report

Apparent inconsistency between R5.11 and R4.13:

" Recommendation R5.11 of the Panel's report proposes a new policy (W2A). This would identify four broad locations in which consideration should be given to the allocation of land for inter-modal freight terminals. Paragraph 5.51 of the report records that in three of the broad locations, there appears to be scope for the provision of such facilities on sites that are outside the Green Belt. Subsequent paragraphs deal with the fourth broad location, at Newton-le-Willows. Paragraph 5.56 states that "if a site is to be identified for such a purpose in a local development document, this would almost certainly necessitate a local review of the Green Belt boundary." It concludes that "... such a review would be justified ...". That conclusion is specific to the provision of an inter-modal freight terminal in the broad location of Newton-le-Willows. It does not apply to other forms of development or to other locations.

Proposed Policy W2A provides that "... A review of the Green Belt boundary in the LDF would be justified in order to accommodate an inter-modal freight terminal in accordance with this policy". As there would be no need to review the Green Belt boundary to provide land for an inter-modal freight terminal in any of the other of the broad locations mentioned in the policy, this provision relates specifically to Newton-le-Willows. Neither the reasoned justification for the proposed Policy W2A, nor the revision to Policy RDF5 proposed in our Recommendation R4.13, would support any other interpretation. However, if the meaning of proposed Policy W2A is not clear, as GONW suggest, the matter could be resolved by the insertion of the words "at Newton-le-Willows" between the words "terminal" and "in" in the penultimate sentence of Recommendation R5.11. This sentence would then read: "... A review of the Green Belt boundary in the LDF would be justified in order to accommodate an inter-modal freight terminal at Newton-le-Willows in accordance with this policy". That would resolve any apparent inconsistency between R5.11 and R4.13."

