

---

# DRAFT REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR THE NORTH WEST

---

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

## **FINAL LIST OF MATTERS AND PARTICIPANTS**

Email: [secretariat@northwesteip.co.uk](mailto:secretariat@northwesteip.co.uk)

## **Matter 1. Vision, Objectives and Overall Approach**

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matters 1A & 1B)**

### **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?

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matters 1C & 1D)**

### **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?

## **(2000 word limit encompasses Matters 1E)**

### **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)/ <del>Blackpool (397)</del> /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) (GVA Grimley)	21	North West Development Consortium (506)/ Paycause Ltd (568) (Barton Willmore)

## **Matter 2. Spatial Strategy**

### **(2000 word limit encompasses Matters 2A & 2B)**

#### **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?

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matters 2C & 2D)**

### **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 <del>Blackburn With Darwen (361)</del> /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	<del>North West Rural Affairs Forum (738)</del>
14	<del>National Farmers Union (567)</del>	15	North West Planning Aid (385)
16	<del>NW Public Transport Users Forum</del> 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

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 3A)**

### 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	<del>NW Public Transport User Forum</del> 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))

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 3B)**

### 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	<del>Northern Way (561)</del>
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)/ <del>Lake District National Park Authority (573)</del>
12	Preston City Council, Chester City Council, Carlisle City Council (468)	13	<del>English Partnerships (505)</del>
14	Tesco Stores Ltd (497) (Development Planning Partnership)	15	North West Transport Activists Roundtable (556)
16	North West Environment Link (628)	17	<del>Haworth Estates (504) (DTZ)</del>
18	Grosvenor (587) (Cushman & Wakefield)		

### Matter 3C: Casinos

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 3C)**

- (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 <del>Blackburn With Darwen (361)</del> /Warrington (622)/ <del>Lake District National Park Authority (573)</del> (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

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matters 4A & 4B)**

#### 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 HMRAs)? 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

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matters 5A & 5B)**

### 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?

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 5C)**

### 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?

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 5D)**

**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)/ <del>Lake District National Park Authority (573)</del> (Hot seating)
12	Highways Agency	13	<del>Network Rail</del>
14	Northern Rail (261)	15	<del>FirstGroup plc (523)</del>
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**

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 6A)**

**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 <del>Blackburn With Darwen</del> (361)/ <del>Blackpool</del> (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	<del>NPL Estates (501)/Miller Homes (NW) Ltd (500)/ Barratt (Manchester) (527)</del> ( <i>How Planning LLP</i> )

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 6B)****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 <del>Blackburn With Darwen (361)/ Blackpool (397)</del> /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))		

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 6C)****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)/ <del>Blackpool (397)</del> /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 Utilities (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.

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 7A & 7B)**

### **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	<del>West Midlands Regional Assembly (525) (7A (iii))</del>
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.

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 8A & 8B)**

#### 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.

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 9A & 9B)**

**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	<del>AGMA (531)</del>	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	Rossendale 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	<del>Heap Land Partnership (319)</del>	25	<del>NW Rural Community Councils (474)</del>
26	<del>NW Planning Aid (385)</del>	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.**

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 10A & 10B)**

**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	<del>Forestry Commission (678)</del>	17	National Trust (736)
18	<del>North West Rural Communities Council (474)</del>	19	Cumbria Strategic Partnership (735)
20	<del>North West Planning Aid (385)</del>	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

**(2000 word limit encompasses Matter 11)**

### 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	<del>North West Planning Aid (385)</del>	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) ( <i>Barton Willmore</i> )		