



Knowsley Council

Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy

Schedule of Potential Modifications to the Submission Document

(13 DECEMBER 2013 VERSION)

CONTENTS

	Page
Part 1 – Introduction	1
Part 2 - Table of Potential Modifications	3
Appendix 1: Core Strategy Policy Delivery Mechanisms	38

PART 1 - INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This schedule details all the potential modifications which have been identified to date by the Council to the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy (KLPCS) following the public hearings which took place in November 2013.
- 1.2 The Schedule should be read in conjunction with the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy Submission document (July 2013). The page/paragraph numbers in the table refer to this document. The schedule includes:
- potential modifications which were identified in the Council's statements for the hearing sessions (issued October 2013); and
 - further potential modifications and/or revisions to modifications already identified resulting from the discussions at the hearing sessions (November 2013).
- 1.3 In some cases, the modifications arise from factual updates and/or changes in Government policy which have arisen following the submission of the KLPCS to the Secretary of State in July 2013.
- 1.4 This schedule does not address all the potential modifications to the KLPCS which were discussed at the hearing sessions in November 2013. Further modifications to the KLPCS and/or revisions to the modifications which are listed here may be identified in the future. The Council intends to consider further the full range of modifications which may be required following publication of the Inspector's interim findings concerning key soundness issues.
- 1.5 This document therefore comprises an interim schedule (as at 12 December 2013). The schedule is structured in the same order as the Core Strategy and contains six columns as follows:
- The **Ref** column identifies the row number of the schedule. The reference given is "PM", which refers to "Potential Modification", reflecting the emerging nature of the schedule at this stage.
 - The **Page/Section** column identifies the page number or section of the KLPCS Submission Document (July 2013) that the potential change relates to
 - The **Policy/Paragraph** column identifies any relevant policy or paragraph of the Submission document
 - The **Change** column details the potential changes to text, diagrams and tables
 - The **Reason** column briefly explains why the change may be necessary.
 - The **Modification Type** column states whether the change would be a main modification or an additional modification if finally agreed by the Council (see below).
- 1.6 The modifications in the schedule are shown as follows:
- **Bold underline** to show text to be inserted; and

- ~~**Bold strike through**~~ to show text to be deleted.

"Main" and "Additional" Modifications

- 1.7 Under Section 20(7) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), as revised by Section 112 of the Localism Act (2011) modifications are either classified as "main" or "additional" modifications. **"Main modifications"** are those which may be required to ensure that the KLPCS is "sound" and legally compliant. **"Additional modifications"** are of a more minor nature and do not materially affect the policies set out in the KLPCS. Additional modifications mainly relate to points where a need has been identified to clarify the text, include updated facts, or make typographical or grammatical revisions which improve the readability of the KLPCS.

Requirement for future approvals and consultation

- 1.8 *The suggested potential modifications to the KLPCS set out in this schedule are put forward to assist the Inspector and representors during the Examination in Public. These and any other potential modifications would need to be approved by the Council's Cabinet and undergo formal public consultation before being considered for inclusion in any version of the KLPCS which is finally adopted.*

PART 2 - TABLE OF POTENTIAL MODIFICATIONS

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
PM01	All	All	<i>Delete footnotes 52 and 126 and renumber all subsequent footnotes accordingly.</i>	Remove footnote 52 due to Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority having agreed on 1/8/13 to remove the Merseytram project as a policy aspiration. Remove footnote 126 due to changes in Government policy regarding sustainability.	Additional
PM02	9	Paragraph 1.43	1.43 The appendices within this document contain important supporting information. Appendix xces A and Appendix B set out a glossary and range of detailed definitions which are referred to within the Core Strategy policies. Appendix C sets-out <u>identifies which the range of</u> UDP policies <u>will be replaced and hence deleted when by</u> the Local Plan Core Strategy <u>is adopted, and hence are deleted on its adoption. Appendix D sets out how each policy of the Core Strategy will be delivered, key risks to delivery and how these have been addressed, and key targets and mechanisms that may trigger remedial measures if a specific policy is not being achieved.</u> "	To reflect addition of new Appendix D	Additional
PM03	19	Paragraph 2.28	2.28 The Government has announced funding approval in principle for the electrification of selected railway lines between	Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			Liverpool and Manchester. There are also long term plans to introduce the Merseytram network, which would connect Liverpool City Centre respectively with Kirkby (Line 1) and Prescott / Whiston (Line 2). Line 1 of Merseytram received Transport and Works Act approval but has been significantly delayed by funding issues. These and additional plans for transport improvements for Knowsley and the wider Merseyside area are set out in the Third Local Transport Plan (LTP3), which covers the period from 2011 until 2024 ⁽⁵²⁾ .	formally agreed on 1/8/13 to remove the Merseytram project as a policy aspiration on the grounds that it is undeliverable.	
PM04	36	Policy CS1, clause 4	4. This approach will also apply in other areas identified as requiring regeneration within Knowsley subject to funding availability. <u>Regeneration will be promoted outside the Principal Regeneration Areas where this is of a scale and nature which meets the needs and opportunities in the local area.</u>	To clarify the way in which the Council will encourage regeneration outside the Principal Regeneration Areas. (Statement 2)	Main
PM05	38	Key Diagram - Label	<i>(The Council may revise this map and its key to make it clearer that Cables Retail Park is proposed to continue to be an edge of centre retail park rather than part of the expanded town centre for Prescott. Any changes to the map which may be needed are likely to be identified following the receipt of the Inspectors interim findings in relation to the southerly expansion of Kirkby town centre, which is covered at present by the same notation).</i>	To ensure consistency with Policies CS 10 and CS 14.	Additional
PM06	39	Policy CS2 clause 1	1. New development in Knowsley <u>and the preparation of subsequent stages of the Local Plan</u> will be expected to	To clarify that the development principles	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.)	Reason	Modification Type
			support the following development principles:	apply to both development proposals and plan preparation. (Statement 2)	
PM07	39	Policy CS2 Principle 1	<p>Principle 1: Promote sustainable economic development, tackle the causes of deprivation and disadvantage and narrow the gap between the richest and poorest neighbourhoods by:</p> <p><u>a. Meeting needs for new housing, employment, retail and other service provision;</u></p> <p>a.<u>b.</u> Improving business productivity and employment levels in Knowsley;</p> <p>b.<u>c.</u> Reducing economic, environmental, education, health and other social inequalities between Knowsley and other parts of the UK; and</p> <p>c.<u>d.</u> Providing opportunities for positive lifestyle choices and health improvement for people of all ages.</p>	To ensure that the key priorities of meeting housing, employment and retail needs are reflected in policy CS2.	Main
PM08	39	Policy CS2 Principle 4 clause i.	4i. Recognising and managing <u>Addressing any issues of unstable land, resulting from</u> Knowsley’s legacy of minerals extraction; and,	Amendment in accordance with the Statement of Common Ground with the Coal Authority.	Main
PM09	42	Policy CS3 clause 1	1. Provision will be made for 8,100 new dwellings to be delivered in Knowsley between 2010 and 2028, at an annual average of 450 dwellings per annum. This is a minimum net figure, accounting for conversions, changes of use to and from residential use, and clearance of dwellings via demolition <u>and is required to meet the need for new housing over the Plan period.</u>	To clarify that the policy aims to provide sufficient housing to meet needs and wider housing growth requirements over the plan period.	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
PM10	42	Policy CS3 clause 2	2. The broad indicative distribution of new housing development to be delivered over the plan period will be as follows: Huyton and Stockbridge Village (33%) <u>(36%)</u> ; Kirkby (15%) <u>(16%)</u> ; Prescot, Whiston, Cronton and Knowsley Village (33%) <u>(32%)</u> ; and Halewood (19%) <u>(16%)</u> .	To reflect changes to distribution brought about through updated evidence. (Statement 3B)	Main
PM11	44	New paragraph (after 5.20)	<i>Insert new paragraph 5.21 under new sub heading of "Rebalancing the Housing Market" as follows:</i> <u>5.21 A key theme running through the Core Strategy is the need to rebalance the housing market in Knowsley in order to meet the needs of local people and address projected out migration. This will include widening the choice of market sector housing across the Borough whilst also helping to meet established needs for affordable housing. There is a particular need to broaden the mix of housing available in areas of relatively high deprivation such as North Huyton, Stockbridge Village and Kirkby.</u> <i>N.B. A re-numbering of following paragraphs will be required</i>	To define the term "rebalancing of the housing market" referred to in clause 4 of policy CS3	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
PM12	44	Paragraph 5.21	5.21 Based on a wide range of evidence which is summarised in the technical papers which support this document, Policy CS 3 indicates in broad terms how new housing delivery will be split between the different township areas of Knowsley. The higher proportion of housing to be located in Huyton and Stockbridge Village results in part from the residential development potential associated with the North Huyton regeneration programme, including the existing committed proposals for replacing previously demolished stock in this area. The remaining township areas <u>of the Borough</u> will <u>each</u> receive between 15% <u>16%</u> and 33% <u>36%</u> of new residential development, depending on their individual needs, and availability of opportunities for location of additional residential development in each area. <u>It is expected that the percentages stated in Policy CS3 may be subject to minor alteration over the Plan period, as evidence regarding delivery and supply is updated. These changes will be reflected in the Local Plan Monitoring Report.</u>	To ensure accuracy in relation to modifications to CS2, and to reflect likely future changes in distribution. (Statement 3B)	Additional
PM13	44	Paragraph 5.23	5.23 The currently envisaged trajectory of new housing delivery, which is based on a best-available estimate of the likely actual rate of delivery against the annual target, is illustrated in Figure 5.1 'Knowsley Housing Trajectory'. This illustrates the sources of land which are anticipated to contribute towards housing delivery over the plan period. Further details regarding this trajectory and its components are available within the Local Plan evidence base and supporting documents. It is critically important that new housing is delivered in accordance with the Local Plan objectives. The	To clarify the circumstances within which a review of Policy CS3 would be undertaken (Statement 3C).	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			<p>Council will therefore monitor the trajectory on an annual basis, and implement review mechanisms if necessary as part of its overall approach set out above. <u>A review of policy CS3 and of related policies may be appropriate if there is significant and sustained under-delivery of housing against the plan period target, to the extent to which the Borough's housing requirements can no longer be met successfully. The Local Plan Monitoring Report will consider this issue on an annual basis.</u></p>		
PM14	45	Paragraph 5.24	<p>5.24 Policy CS 3 adopts a flexible approach to housing density, recognising that there is scope for densities to vary within the Borough. This variance could be based on factors like site location (e.g. high densities adjacent to town centres and transport interchanges) or desirability of housing mix (e.g. lower density housing is needed to re-balance the mix of housing in some areas). However, given housing land availability constraints <u>which currently exist</u> in Knowsley and the character of the Borough, densities of at least 30 and up to 40 dwellings per hectare are considered to be appropriate <u>and lower densities acceptable only in accordance with the criteria in Policy CS3. There are some locations in Knowsley where densities of up to 40 dwellings per hectare or higher may be acceptable.</u></p>	<p>To clarify the position with regard to density within residential developments, and removing reference to 40dph as a maximum. Additionally to provide clarity regarding the circumstances within which higher or lower densities than 30dph would be acceptable (Statement 3C)</p>	Main
PM15	46	Policy CS4 clause 2	<p>2. A total of <u>Provision will be made for</u> 183.5 hectares of land will be identified to be developed for employment uses⁽⁷⁸⁾ between 2010 and 2028, to be located initially within the urban area primarily within the following locations:</p>	<p>To clarify that the provision is for land to be developed for employment use, and avoid misinterpretation as</p>	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowsley Industrial Park (including Knowsley Business Park); • Huyton Business Park; • Kings Business Park; • South Prescott; and • Jaguar Land Rover (Halewood). 	to whether it offers a limitation.	
PM16	52	Policy CS5 clause 1	1. Inappropriate development will not be permitted in the Green Belt <u>except in very special circumstances in which it has been demonstrated that any harm to the Green Belt (for example to its purposes or to its visual and recreational amenities) would be clearly outweighed by other considerations.</u> and the visual and recreational amenities of the Green Belt will be preserved	To ensure consistency with paragraphs 87 and 88 of the NPPF.	Main
PM17	52-53	Policy CS5 clause 6	6. New Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the changes outlined above <u>and detailed boundary changes</u> will be defined in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies.	To clarify that the Council proposes to include further small scale detailed changes to Green Belt boundaries in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck-through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.)	Reason	Modification Type
PM18	53	Policy CS5 clause 7	<p>Major Existing Previously Developed Sites in the Green Belt</p> <p>7. Major Existing Previously Developed Sites in the Green Belt will be identified in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies, where limited infilling and redevelopment will be considered appropriate in principle.</p>	To remove reference to 'Major Developed Sites' which was considered potentially misleading. (Statement 5A)	Main
PM19	58	Paragraph 5.58	<p>Existing Previously Developed Sites within the Green Belt</p> <p>5.58 <u>The Council wishes to allow appropriate future development within previously developed sites in the Green Belt provided the openness of the Green Belt is preserved. Such sites vary widely in type and size and smaller sites may not be identified specifically on the Policies Map. There are However</u> a number of existing previously developed sites in Knowsley's Green Belt. These include including Kings Business Park and several sites used for operational needs by utility companies <u>are of a major scale. The Council intends to identify these major sites in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies, which may also include detailed policy guidance regarding new development within them. The Council wishes to allow appropriate future development within these areas provided the openness of the Green Belt is preserved. These sites, together with detailed policy towards new development within them, will be identified in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies.</u></p>	To remove reference to 'Major Developed Sites' in accordance with current national policy (Statement 5A)	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
PM20	60	Policy CS6 clause 6	<p>Delivery and Monitoring</p> <p>6. The preferred distribution and phasing of new retail floorspace in Table 5.3 'Indicative Distribution of Capacity for New Comparison Retail Floorspace 2012 - 2028', Table 5.4 'Overall Indicative Phasing of Development of New Comparison Retail Floorspace 2012 - 2028' and Table 5.5 'Indicative Distribution of Capacity for Convenience Retail Floorspace 2012 - 2028' are indicative and will be subject to update review during the plan period informed by the Council's Monitoring Reports to reflect changes in retail need and capacity.</p>	To correct the title of Table 5.4, as set out below .and for clarity	Additional
PM21	61	Paragraph 5.64	<p>5.64 "Edge of centre" and / or "out of centre" retail developments are not considered to positively contribute to the viability and vitality of Knowsley's town centres and district centres or provide sustainable retail provision relative to local needs. <u>Proposals for retail development or other town centre uses in an "edge of centre" or "out of centre" location will be unlikely to provide sustainable provision relative to local needs in circumstances where one or more existing site or premises in a town, district or local centre is suitable, available and viable for that development.</u> These types of development will not be considered appropriate to provide or disaggregate the delivery of suggested ranges of retail floorspace during the plan period, unless acceptable justification is provided relative to the absence of suitability or availability of sequentially preferable sites in accordance with the approach to town</p>	<p>To provide additional clarification in terms of the reference to edge of centre and out of centre locations relative to the sequential test.</p> <p>The Council has also reconsidered the issue of impact assessment as addressed at Paragraph 5.64 of the KLPCS, and concluded that the current wording does not provide adequate flexibility to allow a locally set threshold to</p>	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			centre uses set out in Policy CS 4 'Economy and Employment'. In these circumstances, preference will be given to sites which are well connected to town centres, and where sufficient flexibility has been demonstrated in terms of format and scale. An impact assessment will also be required if the development exceeds 2,500 sq.m. <u>(or any locally set threshold defined in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document). which will impact assessments will be expected to assess</u> for example the effects of the scheme on the viability or vitality of any established town, district or local centres.	be introduced in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies (if required). (Supplementary Statement 6)	
PM22	63	Table 5.4 title	Table 5.4 Overall <u>Indicative</u> Phasing of Development of New Comparison Retail Floorspace 2012 - 2028	To ensure consistency with Policy CS 6 clause 6, Tables 5.3 and 5.4, in clarifying that indicative phasing is illustrative of need rather than a restriction upon development.	Additional
PM23	63	Paragraph 5.69	5.69 An <u>outline</u> planning application for a comprehensive phased re-development of Kirkby Town Centre, including a new supermarket and expansion to the south of Cherryfield Drive, was approved in 2011 (<u>planning reference: 10/00505/OUT</u>). The detailed requirements which support the retail led regeneration within Kirkby are set out in Policy CS 10 'Principal Regeneration Area - Kirkby Town Centre'. In view of the existing regeneration needs and opportunities within	To provide clarity in terms of the presence of an extant outline planning permission granted for regeneration within Kirkby Town Centre.	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			Kirkby, the projected phased release of the new comparison retail floorspace is expected to be higher in the early part of the plan period as set out in Table 5.4 'Overall Phasing of Development of New Comparison Retail Floorspace 2012 - 2028' to accommodate the anticipated timescale of development.		
PM24	63	Paragraph 5.70	5.70 <u>Table 5.4 provides indicative measures against which to monitor ongoing delivery of retail development over the plan period. The indicative phasing of development reflects illustrates</u> a front loading of <u>identified</u> need to accommodate existing commitments. <u>It is not however intended to restrict other opportunities for delivery of sustainable retail growth that positively contribute to the viability and vitality of Knowsley's town, district and local centres at the earliest opportunity.</u> , therefore any resultant under delivery relative to the base level at the end of each five year period can reasonably be carried forward and added to the base level in the subsequent five year period to ensure appropriate delivery across the plan period. Performance monitoring of delivery relative to <u>up to date evidence relating to needs, together with</u> the <u>indicative</u> capacity ranges, distribution to centres and phasing schedule will be managed through the Council's Monitoring Reports <u>in accordance with the policy delivery mechanisms set out at Appendix D.</u>	To clarify that the indicative phasing is illustrative of need and set out for performance monitoring purposes rather than a restriction on development.	Additional
PM25	63	Paragraph 5.72	5.72 The majority of need for new convenience retail floorspace arises in the early part of the plan period up to 2017,	To clarify the reason why indicative phasing for	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			due to unacceptably low levels of expenditure retention and an uneven quality of provision, including the absence of a major foodstore in Kirkby Town Centre. This removes the need for specific indicative phasing <u>of convenience retail throughout over</u> the plan period, noting that this centre has an extant planning permission. The indicative distribution is provided in Table 5.5 'Indicative Distribution of Capacity for Convenience Retail Floorspace 2012 - 2028', including extant permissions which have not commenced development <u>and an unallocated reserve to support other sustainable opportunities to improve provision relative to local needs.</u>	convenience retail is not identified, and the purpose of the unallocated reserve	
PM26	66	Policy CS7 clause 2e	2e. Inclusive of emerging new technologies <u>measures</u> that will mitigate or minimise carbon emissions and improve air quality <u>where appropriate</u> ; and	To clarify that the Council is adequately considering flexibility for circumstances where all requirements for development may not be applicable, achievable or viable to implement.	Main
PM27	66	Policy CS7 clause 3c	3c. Line 1 of the Merseytram network linking Kirkby to Liverpool City Centre;	Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority formally agreed on 1/8/13 to remove the Merseytram project as a policy aspiration on the grounds that it is undeliverable.	Main
PM28	66	Policy CS7 3.d – 3.g	<i>Renumber clauses 3.d – 3.g to 3.c – 3.f to reflect deletion of former clause 3.c.</i>	As above	Minor Editorial

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
PM29	69	Policy CS8 clause 6c	6c. <u>Seek to P-protect</u> , maintain and <u>where possible</u> enhance biodiversity within and around new developments, to provide space for nature.	To enable adequate flexibility for consideration of circumstances where appropriate justification of limited opportunities for enhancement could be provided.	Main
PM30	69	Policy CS8 new clause 6d	<u>6d. Provide necessary mitigation and / or compensation for Green Infrastructure or biodiversity loss, in circumstances where harm resulting from the development is otherwise unavoidable.</u>	To ensure consistency with NPPF Paragraph 176.	Main
PM31	83	Paragraph 6.19 Kirkby Box Bullet 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enhance transport links between residential neighbourhoods and Kirkby Town Centre and Knowsley Industrial Park, and between Kirkby and other places in the Liverpool City Region. This may (subject to funding) include construction of Merseytram Line 1 and a rail interchange / park and ride at Headbolt Lane; 	Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority formally agreed on 1/8/13 to remove the Merseytram project as a policy aspiration on the grounds that it is undeliverable.	Additional
PM32	85	Policy CS10 clause 2c	2c. Requiring development proposals to be sufficiently flexible to integrate and safeguard the potential delivery of the Merseytram Line 1 route along Cherryfield Drive.	Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority formally agreed on 1/8/13 to remove the Merseytram project as a policy aspiration on the grounds that it is undeliverable.	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
PM33	86	Paragraph 6.24	Potential improvements to the transport network in Kirkby (such as those defined in Policy CS 7 'Transport Networks' including the Merseytram Line 1 scheme) will need to be integrated into the design of new development in Kirkby Town Centre. Kirkby Town Centre is also close to strategic green links, particularly the Valley Corridor to the west. There is potential to better integrate these Green Infrastructure assets by creating new footpaths and cycle routes to improve accessibility.	Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority formally agreed on 1/8/13 to remove the Merseytram project as a policy aspiration on the grounds that it is undeliverable.	Additional
PM34	87	Policy CS11 clause 1a	1a. Class B1 “business” uses within “gateway” locations at: A580 West/Moorgate Road; A5208 County Road/South Boundary Road/Moorgate Road/Arbour Lane; and at A580 East/Coopers Lane (<u>subject to compliance with the sequential test in policy CS4</u>);	In the interest of clarity with regard to the application of the sequential test.	Main
PM35	87	Policy CS11 clause 1c	1c. Class B1 and B2 <u>B8</u> uses south of South Boundary Road; and,	Typographical error resulted in inconsistency of applying recommendations from Knowsley Industrial Park Strategic Framework. (Statement 4C)	Main
PM36	96	Map 6.3 Prescott, Whiston, Cronton and Knowsley	<i>(The Council may revise this map and its key to make it clearer that Cables Retail Park is proposed to continue to be an edge of centre retail park rather than part of the expanded town centre for Prescott. Any changes to the map which may be needed are likely to be identified following the receipt of the Inspectors interim findings in relation to the southerly</i>	To ensure consistency with Policy CS14.	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
		Village – Label	<i>expansion of Kirkby town centre, which is covered by the same notation).</i>		
PM37	97	Policy CS13 clause 1a	1a. “New economic development ⁽¹¹³⁾ , including development of high quality Class B1 “Business” uses in gateway sites on Carr Lane and Manchester Road (<u>subject to compliance with the sequential test in policy CS4</u>);”	In the interest of clarity with regard to the application of the sequential test. (Statement 4C)	Main
PM38	99	Policy CS14 clause 1c	1c. Improving linkages and integration between Cables Retail Park and the existing town centre, including appropriate new town centre development along Sewell Street, and potentially extending the designated town centre boundary in this direction; and	In the interest of consistency and clarity regarding the Council’s intentions. (Statement 6)	Main
PM39	99	Policy CS14 clause 2	2. Restructuring of retail provision within Cables Retail Park will be supported where this would: a. Provide for convenience or bulky goods retailing; b. a. Improve design quality and layout; and c. b. Improve linkages to Eccleston Street.; and d. Maintain the current retail floorspace capacity of the Retail Park, inclusive of extant planning permissions.	Deletion of policy CS14 clause 2 a) and d), on the grounds that the sequential and impact tests set out in Paragraphs 23 to 27 of the NPPF and in policy CS4 provide for sufficient safeguards in relation to restructuring proposals in an edge of centre location. (Supplementary Statement 6)	Main
PM40	101	Paragraph	6.58 The Council considers Cables Retail Park to have	To ensure consistency with	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
		6.58	reached its retail capacity, although there could be scope for appropriate remodelling and renewal of units within the retail park. This could enable units to be provided of a different scale and format than those capable of being provided in the town centre itself. Any future expansion of the retail park is constrained by the barriers provided by the A57, Steley Way and Sewell Street highway network. Therefore, the priority for any future development should be restructuring of retail floorspace with in the existing layout and improvements <u>to layout</u> and design quality.	the main modification to Policy CS14 clause 2. (Supplementary Statement 6)	
PM41	108	Policy CS15 clause 1f	1f. All new affordable housing delivered through this policy will be made available in perpetuity in partnership with Registered Providers <u>should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision</u>	To reflect recognition that there are other models for delivery of affordable housing in perpetuity, not necessarily linked to registered housing providers (Statement 7 as revised during hearing session)	Main
	108	Policy CS15	<i>(The Council may also wish to modify the target which is set for affordable housing in this policy. Any changes to this will be identified in a future version of this schedule).</i>		
PM42	109	Paragraph 7.6	7.6 The policy also includes the ability for the target to be varied in circumstances where the developer can demonstrate, with clear and transparent evidence, that meeting the target would render the specific development economically unviable. Given that The policy has been set with regard to Borough-	To acknowledge that developers are likely to seek a lowering of the affordable housing target in circumstances which are	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			<p>wide economic viability evidence, it is expected that this circumstance will occur only exceptionally. <u>Any proposals to relax the 25% requirement will need to be justified having regard to specific and independently verifiable evidence concerning the viability of the development proposal</u>. Similarly, the developer will need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in the instance that off-site or financial rather than on-site provisions are sought. Such circumstances will need to be set out clearly in relation to development-specific constraints and/or economic viability. This is in order that the affordable housing provided is mixed with the market housing, thereby meeting plan objectives around the provision of balanced and sustainable residential communities. Policy CS 27 'Planning and Paying for New Infrastructure' sets out in more detail how developer contributions will operate within the Borough. This will be supplemented by a Developer Contributions SPD and/or a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule.</p>	<p>more frequent than is implied by the term "exceptionally" (Statement 7).</p>	
PM43	107-108	New paragraph 7.10	<p><u>7.10 When affordable housing is proposed to be delivered in connection with market housing developments, the Council will normally seek a legal agreement to ensure that the affordable housing provided remains at an affordable price for future eligible households or that any subsidy is recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.</u></p> <p><i>NB Subsequent paragraphs will need to be renumbered</i></p>	<p>To provide consistency with reference to the NPPF guidance for availability of affordable housing in the longer term (Glossary entry, page 50)</p>	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.)	Reason	Modification Type
PM44	112	Policy CS17 clause 4.	<p>4. All new residential development in Knowsley will be required encouraged to comply with the following design standards (or equivalent replacement standard):</p> <p>a. Building for Life Standards, in line with government policy;</p> <p>b. Lifetime Homes design criteria;</p> <p>c. Code for Sustainable Homes standards, as set out in Policy CS 22 'Sustainable and Low Carbon Development';</p> <p>d. c. Specific design <u>and sustainability</u> guidance in Policy CS 19 'Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development', <u>Policy CS22: Sustainable and Low Carbon Development</u> and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents ⁽¹²¹⁾.</p>	To provide flexibility for proposed national changes to Code for Sustainable Homes / Building Regulations, and noting that for some developments (particularly in areas where development viability is challenging), the cost of meeting Lifetime Homes and Building for Life standards may in conjunction with other requirements be sufficient to place the delivery of the development at risk.	Main
PM45	114	Paragraph 7.21	<p>7.21 Building for Life: The Building for Life criteria represent the national standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods, as recognised by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment and the Home Builders Federation. The twenty Building for Life criteria area used in assessments of development schemes, which are then graded as "very good", "good", "average" or "poor". Schemes scoring 14/20 or 15/20 are awarded a "silver standard", whilst those scoring 16/20 or more receive a "gold standard". Building for Life Awards are also given to exceptional schemes, awarded by a panel of</p>	To update information relating to Building for Life standards, and changes made to Policy CS17 (Statement 9)	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			<p>judges. The Homes and Communities Agency has set out in its proposed core housing design and sustainability standards consultation plans to make achieving 14/20 of the Building for Life criteria mandatory. The Council supports Building for Life assessments and will apply at least the minimum mandatory national standards in this regard to all new residential development. <u>Building for Life represents the industry standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods, endorsed by Government. In 2013, an updated Building for Life scheme was launched by the Home Builders Federation, Design for Homes and Cabe at the Design Council, known as “Building for Life 12”. This scheme includes twelve criteria which are rated for each development using a traffic light system. “Amber” and “red” outcomes indicate that the scheme will need to be changed, whilst a “green” outcome indicates that the criteria have been fully met. If it is agreed between the developer, stakeholders and the Council that all criteria have been met the scheme will be eligible for Building for Life 12 “Diamond status”. The Council supports the undertaking of Building for Life assessments and the meeting of all 12 criteria will be encouraged.</u></p>		
PM46	114	Paragraph 7.23	<p>7.23 Code for Sustainable Homes: The Code for Sustainable Homes (the Code) is the national standard for the sustainable design and construction of new homes, which measure the sustainability of a new home against nine categories of sustainable design⁽⁴²⁶⁾. Further information about the application of the Code in Knowsley</p>	To reflect changes to national government guidance. (Statement 9)	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.)	Reason	Modification Type
			<p>can be found in Policy CS 22 'Sustainable and Low Carbon Development'.</p> <p>Footnote 126 Available to view online at http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/sustainability/codesustainablehomes/</p> <p><i>N.B. A re-numbering of following paragraphs will be required.</i></p>		
PM47	116	Policy CS18 clause 5	<p>5. The Council will establish the level of need for a site or sites in Knowsley for the accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers and/or Travelling Showpeople with reference to up-to-date evidence. Due consideration will be given to the size of the site(s) required and the number of pitches which will need to be accommodated, with reference to the available evidence of need and demand for new accommodation, and any appropriate viability issues. <u>In line with national policy, the target for accommodation to be provided, including appropriate five year requirements, and the</u> location of any site(s) required <u>to meet the target</u> will be identified in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies, using the criteria in this policy for guidance.</p>	To provide clarity regarding the Council's intention to prepare policy relating to Gypsy and Traveller / Travelling Showpeople provision, to be set out in a subsequent Local Plan document (Statement 7 plus further changes)	Main
PM48	117	Paragraph 7.27	<p>7.27 The Council will therefore maintain an up-to-date evidence base on this matter, accounting for evidence previously collected through the Merseyside GTAA, regionally collated evidence ⁽¹³¹⁾ and also for any newly collected evidence about the need and demand for accommodation in Knowsley. The Council will then finalise its approach to</p>	To support main modifications made to Policy CS18 with reference to compliance with national policy.	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			planning for travelling communities, <u>including setting plan period and five year pitch targets</u> , and if appropriate, outline the size of site(s) which will be required, <u>in line with national policy</u> . Should the need for a site or sites be identified, this will be allocated within a subsequent Local Plan document, using the criteria in Policy CS 18 to identify an appropriate location(s). Particular emphasis will be placed on ensuring that any proposed site is viable in terms of size and location and that it would be attractive to travelling communities, and hence deliverable in planning terms.		
PM49	119	Policy CS19 clause 3a	3a. Sustainable design principles, with regard to national accredited standards , Policy CS 17 'Housing Sizes and Design Standards' and Policy CS 22 'Sustainable and Low Carbon Development' as appropriate;	To improve the clarity and effectiveness of the policy requirement.	Main
PM50	119	Policy CS19 clause 3b	3b. Biodiversity enhancements <u>(in accordance with policy CS 8)</u> ;	To assist the read across between the two policies in terms of biodiversity requirements	Main
PM51	119	Policy CS19 clause 3c	3c. Flood risk mitigation <u>(in accordance with policy CS 24)</u> ;	To assist the read across between the two policies in terms of the requirements for flood risk mitigation. (Statement 9)	Main
PM52	122	Policy CS20	1b. Prevent demolition and / or development which adversely affects <u>would result in substantial harm or the loss of</u>	To ensure consistency with national policy by including	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
		clause 1b.	<u>designated historic assets</u> subject to statutory designation or its setting: and, <u>unless the proposal would result in substantial public benefits which clearly outweigh the harm or loss;</u>	flexibility for public benefits that outweigh harm or loss of heritage assets that is set out in the NPPF (paragraphs 132-134). (Statement 8)	
PM53	122	Policy CS20 new clause 1c.	<u>1c. Where a development proposal will result in less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, assess such harm against the benefits of the proposal.</u>	To ensure consistency with national policy in terms of harm or loss of heritage assets that is set out in the NPPF (paragraphs 132-134). (Statement 8)	Main
PM54	122	Policy CS20 clause 1d	1c. <u>d.</u> Facilitate long term conservation and enhancement of local assets and areas of historic importance, including through the preparation of Conservation Area Management Plans.	Previous clause 1c. renumbered to clause 1d. to reflect the additional clause via main modification.	Additional
PM55	124	Paragraph 8.19	8.19 Other important areas and historic buildings and structures in Knowsley are also valuable to local distinctiveness and character, despite falling outside of national statutory designations, and therefore the policy ensures an appropriate approach with an expectation that their character will be integrated with new development. The Council will support this approach by producing a local list of buildings which are important in a local context because of their	To clarify that the Design Quality and New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will introduce additional policy guidance to support the existing criteria within the	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			contribution to the area’s character, with supplementary policy criteria guidance provided via the Design Quality and New Development SPD.	KLPCS rather than provide new criteria. (Statement 8)	
PM56	126	Policy CS21 clause 2e.	2e. Where the proposal relates to <u>the loss of</u> indoor or outdoor sports provision, <u>and</u> there is no evidence of future or continuing need for sports use, or alternatively only land incapable of forming a playing pitch or sporting facility is affected <u>and its release accords with either clause 2a or 2b.</u>	The Council identified potential for misinterpretation of policy CS21, clause 2e, in circumstances where a proposal on urban greenspace is for alternative sports and recreation provision, and clause 2 is not considered as a whole. The modification is intended to correct this issue.	Main
PM57	126	Policy CS21 clause 3	3. Irrespective of whether criteria in 2. are met, <u>unless the benefits of a proposal clearly outweigh the</u> loss of urban greenspace, <u>development</u> will be resisted where it would result in significantly harm <u>any existing or potential special qualities of greenspace in the area in terms of</u> to one or more of the following existing or potential special qualities of greenspace: a. Visual amenity; b. Residential amenity; c. Biodiversity and environmental benefits; d. Historical, cultural or community value;	The Council has identified that the wording of policy CS21 clause 3 could be mistakenly interpreted to imply that all greenspaces would be subject to the special qualities listed. This is not the intention of the policy and the modification is intended to correct this issue.	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			e. Recreational benefits; or, f. Physical and / or visual linkages between adjoining urban greenspaces.		
PM58	127	Policy CS21 clause 9	9. Any Local Green Spaces Designations (as referred to in the National Planning Policy Framework) which are formally designated will be identified in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies or future Neighbourhood Plans (if applicable). <u>This designation will only be used where the greenspace concerned is:</u> a. <u>reasonably close to the community it serves;</u> b. <u>demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</u> c. <u>local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</u>	To ensure consistency of read across with the NPPF and the effectiveness of the implementation of the policy, criteria for Local Green Spaces designations are listed. (Statement 8)	Main
PM59	128	Policy CS21 clause 10.	10. The Council will require <u>encourage</u> proposals for new development to incorporate: a. Retention of existing trees, woodland, vegetation and other habitat features which offer a positive contribution to the local environment in terms of visual amenity, recreation value or biodiversity/wildlife interest; b. Appropriate planting of trees, other soft landscaping and installation of habitat features for the benefit of biodiversity; and c. Adequate replacement provision where tree loss is unavoidable, comprising two additional trees for every tree lost and taking account of species and size.	To ensure consistency with modifications to CS8 to allow flexibility in circumstances where such requirements are not feasible or viable to undertake on-site, to allow alternative compensation.	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.)	Reason	Modification Type
PM60	133	Policy CS22 clause 2	2. Government targets for carbon reduction in new development are expected to be implemented through updates to the Building Regulations. Where it is not technically feasible or economically viable to meet the requirements on site, contributions to the Council's Community Energy Fund may be accepted as part one of <u>a range of options under</u> the Government's proposed "Allowable Solutions" mechanism. The Fund will be used to support carbon reduction initiatives in Knowsley and potentially the wider Liverpool City Region.	<p>The Government has published for consultation purposes a 'Housing Standards Review', proposals to abolish the Code for Sustainable Homes and updates to Building Regulations (Part L).</p> <p>Additional Government guidance is expected in the form of a new national planning statement on housing.</p> <p>The above mentioned changes (in cumulative) mean that a number of clauses within CS 22 are now out of date. (Statement 9)</p>	Main
PM61	133	Policy CS22 clause 3	3. New residential development granted permission between the dates set out below will be encouraged to meet the following Code for Sustainable Homes levels (including aspects of the Code standards which are not covered by Building	See above. (Statement 9)	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			Regulations): a. Between 2013 and 2016 - Level 4; and b. After 2016 - Level 5 (equating to "zero carbon" development).		
PM62	133	Policy CS22 clause 4	4. New non-residential development granted permission between the dates set out below will be encouraged to meet the following Building Research Establishments Environmental Assessment Methodology (BREEAM) ratings (including aspects of the ratings which are not covered by Building Regulations): a. Up to 2019 - "Very good"; and b. After 2019 - "Excellent".	See above. (Statement 9)	Main
PM63	133	Policy CS22 clause 5	5. Relaxations to the standards set out in 3 and 4 above may be allowed where the applicant demonstrates it is not feasible to meet the prescribed standards	See above. (Statement 9)	Main
PM64	133	Policy CS22 clause 6	6. <u>3.</u> Local targets for sustainability in relation to specific development areas or sites may be outlined in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies.	Previous clause 6. renumbered to clause 3. to reflect the deletion of previous clauses via main modification.	Additional
PM65	133	Policy CS22 clause 7	7. Where technically feasible and economically viable, major development proposals will be required to include decentralised renewable and low carbon energy systems.	See above (Statement 9)	Main
PM66		Policy	8. <u>4.</u> Knowsley Industrial Park and Knowsley Business Park	Previous clause 8.	

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
		CS22 clause 8	are identified as a "Priority Zone". Within this area the Council and its partners will facilitate renewable and low carbon infrastructure by (subject to feasibility) requiring new development to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Make provision for connection to an existing or planned decentralised energy network; and b. Be designed to enable future connectivity in terms of proposed site layout, infrastructure and heating provision, including consideration of connections at a later date or phase. 	renumbered to clause 4. to reflect the deletion of previous clauses via main modification.	
PM67		Policy CS22 clause 9	9. 6. Subject to opportunity and need, additional "Priority Zones" may be identified in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies.	Previous clause 9. renumbered to clause 6. to reflect the deletion of previous clauses via main modification.	
PM68	134	Policy CS22 clause 10	10. Developers must demonstrate compliance with the requirements of this policy through documents submitted with planning applications. Further details on all the requirements, including the charging mechanism for the Community Energy Fund, will be outlined in the Sustainability in Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document, Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document and/or Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule.	See above. (Statement 9)	Main
PM69	135-136	Paragraph 9.7-9.10	Sustainable Construction	As above. (Statement 9)	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			<p>9.7 While the Council acknowledges that improvements in construction quality and energy efficiency will be made through proposed updates to the Building Regulations, it is considered appropriate that developers should also consider the need for wider sustainable development measures. Therefore, Policy CS 22 encourages new developments to meet sustainable design and construction targets, expressed in the context of the Code for Sustainable Homes for residential development, and Building Research Establishments Environmental Assessment Methodology (BREEAM) ratings for other types of development. These nationally recognised standards encourage new developments to achieve high standards of environmental performance which: minimise levels of energy and water consumption; minimise the environmental impact arising from generation of waste, surface water run-off, and pollution; encourage the use of recycled materials and sustainable construction management; and minimise impacts on ecology and occupant health and wellbeing.</p> <p>9.8 The elements of the national standards outlined in Policy CS 22 which relate to energy efficiency are consistent with standards which will be required by proposed revisions to Buildings Regulations (Part L) in 2013, 2016 and 2019. Developers will be required to comply with the Building Regulations as a minimum. The Council also wishes to encourage developers to meet those aspects of the Code for Sustainable Homes and</p>		

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			<p>BREEAM standards which do not relate to energy use, and are therefore excluded from the currently proposed changes to the Building Regulations. Policy CS 22 will complement future updates to the Building Regulations and be consistent with the Council's powers under the Climate Change Act. If the Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM are replaced by other national assessment methods, Policy CS 22 will encourage development to meet the new equivalent standards.</p> <p>9.9 To increase the level of renewable and low carbon energy generated, national policy allows, where viability can be demonstrated, the setting of phased authority-wide targets for the reduction of carbon emissions. At present, the Council assumes that the changes to Building Regulations will proceed as planned. If there is a significant change in the direction of government policy the Council may seek to implement a local and/or location specific target(s) for carbon reduction.</p> <p><u>9.7 The Government launched a 'Housing Standards Review' consultation in August 2013 which seeks views on ways to reduce the degree of variation in housing design guidance, codes and standards at the local level. Many of these design aspects are expected to be covered by future updates to Building Regulations (subject to the outcome of the current consultation). Depending on the outcome of this the Council will either completely rely on Building Regulations to deliver sustainable design or (where</u></p>		

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck-through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			<p><u>compatible with the Government's approach) consider the need for some aspects to be defined by local policies in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies. Any local policies which are developed are likely to relate to aspects of design which are not covered by the Building Regulations.</u></p> <p>9.10 <u>9.8</u> The Merseyside and Halton Joint Waste Local Plan⁽¹⁴³⁾ (at Policy WM 10) proposes that the specific BREEAM targets will also apply to proposals for waste management uses <u>facilities</u>.</p> <p><i>N.B. A re-numbering of following paragraphs will be required.</i></p>		
PM70	137	Paragraph 9.14-9.16	<p>Community Energy Fund</p> <p>9.14 The Council's "Community Energy Fund" will <u>may</u> be used to deliver a range of carbon reduction projects. Developers who are unable to meet the proposed targets for "zero carbon" development through on site measures in line with the Building Regulations may be able <u>have the option</u> to make contributions to the fund <u>as one of a range of options</u> under the Government's proposed "Allowable Solutions" mechanism. The scale of contributions to the Fund which are required will have regard to the economic viability of the development proposed, in accordance within Policy CS 27 'Planning and Paying for New Infrastructure'. A subsequent planning document will outline the scale of contributions required and a schedule of schemes supported by the</p>	To reflect emerging changes to the Government's zero carbon homes agenda and Allowable Solutions. (Statement 9)	

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			<p>Council and its partners. This may be the proposed Sustainability in Design and Construction SPD; Developer Contributions SPD and/or CIL Charging Schedule.</p> <p>9.15 The Government has at the time of writing yet to publish detailed national guidance identifying the precise scope of the Allowable Solutions mechanism, how contributions through this may be made and what the relationship is with the Community Infrastructure Levy regime (see Policy CS 27). If the Government decides that Allowable Solutions fall within the remit of the Community Infrastructure Levy legislation, and the Council decides to implement a CIL in Knowsley, the Community Energy Fund is likely to be incorporated into the Council's CIL Charging Schedule.</p> <p>9.16 Developers will, with some exceptions for example for minor developments, be expected to demonstrate compliance with Policy CS 22 through details submitted with planning applications, which may be within an energy statement or as part of other submitted documents.</p> <p><i>N.B. A re-numbering of following paragraphs will be required.</i></p>		
PM71	143	Policy CS25 clause 2.	2. Minerals Safeguarding Areas (<u>MSAs</u>) for viable mineral deposits considered to be of current or future economic importance <u>mineral resources of national and local importance</u> will be identified in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies and shown on the Proposals	To ensure consistency with NPPF paragraph 143. (Statement 10 and Statement of Common Ground with Coal	Main

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck-through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
			<p><u>Policies</u> Map. <u>The purpose of such MSAs will be to ensure that such resources are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development whilst not creating a presumption that resources defined will be worked</u></p>	Authority)	
PM72	144	New Paragraph 9.30	<p><u>9.30 A Local Aggregates Assessment is being prepared for the Greater Manchester, Merseyside, Halton and Warrington area. The work undertaken to date indicates that land banks for crushed rock (15.9yrs) and sand and gravel (12.4yrs) in the sub-region are sufficient to satisfy policy requirements (10yrs and 7yrs respectively). The main findings for Knowsley are that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Knowsley has no active or dormant aggregate extraction sites and no resources of primary aggregate material;</u> • <u>Knowsley is a net importer of aggregate material (as is the sub-region as a whole); and</u> • <u>Knowsley’s main means of contributing to the supply of aggregate is by promoting resource efficiency and the use of secondary and recycled materials.</u> <p><u>The Local Aggregates Assessment will be updated periodically and any changes to the above will be reported in the Council’s Monitoring Reports.</u></p> <p><i>N.B. A footnote referencing the final document and a re-numbering of existing Paragraphs 9.31 – 9.35 will be required.</i></p>	To provide clarity to the current situation with necessary flexibility for circumstances to change during the plan period.	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
PM73	151	Policy CS27 clause 3	3. Proposals for new development must have regard to and demonstrate compliance with the Knowsley Infrastructure Development Plan, <u>insofar as this is appropriate to the scale and nature of the development.</u>	To clarify that consideration / compliance with the IDP will apply only to developments of a sufficiently significant scale and/or nature (Statement 11)	Main
PM74	152	Policy CS27 clause 6	6. Where legal agreements are to be used to secure site specific developer contributions, these could be subject to site specific negotiations regarding the impacts of the contributions on the economic viability of new development. Where a developer believes that meeting policy requirements would place development at risk, the developer will be required to submit development-specific economic viability evidence to support this position. Such evidence must clearly account for site-specific circumstances and costs and must be undertaken objectively and transparently. The developer will also be required to provide funds for the independent scrutiny of any viability evidence submitted to the Council. Further guidance about the Council's approach to such negotiations will be provided in the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document or a Supplementary Planning Document.	To reflect change in approach to funding of scrutiny of viability evidence (Statement 11)	Main
	152	Policy CS27	<i>(The Council may decide to introduce further modifications to policy CS27 to address the prioritisation of policy "asks" for which developer contributions will be sought. Any modification of this nature will be set out in a future version of the schedule).</i>		

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.	Reason	Modification Type
PM75	152-153	Paragraph 10.9	10.9 The Core Strategy plan period is to 2028, and it is appropriate to account for a similar time period within the IDP. While it is possible to identify clear short to medium term infrastructure priorities, long term infrastructure planning is likely to be lacking in detail, due to uncertainty around future project planning and funding. Therefore the Knowsley IDP will be subject to regular review and will be updated with new projects and priorities as appropriate, throughout the plan period. <u>Such updates will be carried out in consultation with stakeholders and proposed revisions subject to public consultation.</u> The latest version of the Knowsley IDP is available on the Council's website.	To clarify that the IDP will be updated in consultation with key stakeholders and that revised versions will be subject to public consultation prior to adoption (Statement 11)	Additional
PM76	153	Paragraph 10.12	10.12 Each of these policies sets out the requirements which must be met to secure appropriate infrastructure provision over the plan period. Sufficient flexibility is provided by Policy CS 27 so that any additional infrastructure requirements, not covered by the above policies, but integral to ensuring that development remains acceptable in planning terms relative to site specific circumstances, can be delivered through Developer Contributions. The Council expects that these requirements will be negotiated between the Council and the developer through the planning application process, having regard to the relevant legal and regulatory tests. <u>The Council will also issue guidance regarding prioritisation between different developer contributions in a subsequent Local Plan document or Supplementary Planning Document.</u> <i>(NOTE – The Council is considering whether this issue needs</i>	To clarify the Council's intention to provide further guidance regarding prioritisation of developer contributions policies in a subsequent document (Statement 11)	Additional

Ref	Page / Section	Policy / Paragraph	Change (Deleted text in bold struck through ; new text <u>underlined in bold</u> ; changes to diagrams, tables, etc described in <i>italic</i> text.)	Reason	Modification Type
			<i>to be addressed through revisions to policy CS27 instead – if so further modification to policy CS27 would be identified in a future version of this schedule)</i>		
PM77	155	Paragraph 10.19	10.19 In such cases, the Council considers that the onus should be on developers to prove that meeting set policy requirements would place development at risk, and that exceptional circumstances exist for the developer contribution requirements to be varied. The developer will therefore be required to submit development-specific viability evidence to support their position, accounting for site-specific circumstances and costs. The Council will scrutinise any evidence submitted, but will require developers to fund this scrutiny , which must be undertaken independently, objectively and transparently. The Council intends to publish further guidance regarding this process, including what information will be required. This will be set out within a subsequent Local Plan or Supplementary Planning Document.	To ensure consistency following modification of the wording of Policy CS27 (see above) (Statement 11)	Additional
PM78	xxxii	Appendix D	New Appendix D to reflect Core Strategy Policy Delivery Mechanisms (see attached Appendix 1)	To ensure consistency of Council approach with respect to scrutiny of evidence submitted to support planning applications.	Additional

Appendix 1: CORE STRATEGY POLICY DELIVERY MECHANISMS (NEW APPENDIX D)

POLICY OF KLPCS	SD1 Sustainable Development
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management process • Influence on other policies, plans and procedures
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	111, 112
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National and local targets for applications determined in 8/13 weeks (MI 111)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making risks on planning applications • Policy not reflected in other plans and policies
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparent policy approach to inform decision making • Account for all Local Plan policies in subsequently prepared documents
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant decision making delays and/or high rates of appeals being upheld
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of development management processes and resources

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS1 Spatial Strategy for Knowsley
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross cutting policy – see other CS policies
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	1, 4, 18, 21, 23, 38, 39, 41, 44, 49, 54, 64, 65, 67, 69, 70, 97, 106, 113
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross cutting policy – see targets for other CS policies
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rate of development delivery continues to be lower than targeted due to a slow recovery from recession (see policies CS3, CS4 and CS6) • Regeneration of the Principal Regeneration Areas is not delivered or only partially delivered (see policies CS9 - CS14) • Delays in provision of strategic infrastructure
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See policies stated in key risks for specific triggers. • Engagement with key infrastructure providers in the development of the KLPCS and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See information on policies stated in "key risks" section above for specific triggers.
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support. • Potential review of Plan • Release of Green Belt land as housing or employment supply as required (see policy CS5)

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS2 Development Principles
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation and development management processes.
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	7, 8, 9, 14, 38, 39, 64 , 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70 , 73, 74, 78, 82, 83, 86, 93, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 115
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross cutting policy – see targets for other CS policies
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocations and development management decisions need to be based on a balanced assessment of the principles set out in this policy
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocations process will be carefully evidenced to ensure that it takes account of the principles set out here. • Development management decisions will take account of any of the principles which are relevant to the specific decision
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High rates of appeals being upheld based on specific principles which are set out.
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of development management processes including weight given to specific principles in decisions.

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS3 Housing Supply, Delivery and Distribution
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of sufficient quantum will be managed via phasing mechanism – see policy CS3 (clause 3) and CS5. Reporting in SHLAA or Monitoring Report. • Investment in private sector and Registered Provider housing (e.g. current Affordable Housing Programme) • Site allocation and development management processes. • Partnership working on residential-led regeneration programmes e.g. North Huyton, Tower Hill
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 70, 106
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An average of 450 net dwelling completions per annum between 2010/11 and 2027/28 (MI 19 and MI 20) • At least 2250 dwellings deliverable within 5 years (with NPPF buffer) (MI 30 and MI 31) • Decreases in empty homes, choice based letting demands, persons registered as homeless and households in fuel poverty (MI 26, 34, 35 and 37) • Increase in empty homes brought back into use (MI 27) • % new dwellings accessible by public transport, cycle and walking etc. in accordance with the "Ensuring a Choice of Travel" SPD/LTP (MI 70)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer / landowner intentions • Land availability assessment • Completion rates not meeting required levels over a sustained period, resulting in an overall housing shortfall, and housing need (including affordable housing need) increasing to unsustainable levels. • Residents moving out of Knowsley to access appropriate housing elsewhere with knock-on effects such as longer commuting patterns and more traffic, decline in the local economy, and in extreme cases homelessness.
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffer or “headroom” of housing development opportunities provided • 20% risk applied to SHLAA sites • Engagement with landowners e.g. call for sites exercises • Comprehensive assessment of viability of housing land supply – see Housing Position Statement • Viability caveats included in policies CS15 and CS27

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS3 Housing Supply, Delivery and Distribution
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent and significant under delivery e.g. over a five year period • Failure to provide deliverable supply at any one time for 2,250 dwellings plus flexibility as required by NPPF para. 47
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support • Review of viability evidence • Release of Green Belt land as housing supply (see policy CS5) • Potential review of Plan

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS4 Economy and Employment
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of sufficient quantum of land will be managed via phasing mechanism – see policy CS4 (clause 4) and CS5. • Employment-led Regeneration programmes e.g. Knowsley Industrial and Business Parks • Economic Regeneration Strategy implementation • Education, employment and skills programmes • Access to work assisted by transport schemes e.g. Local Sustainable Transport Fund
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 32, 54, 55, 102, 103, 104, 106
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.2 hectares land developed for employment uses per annum (MI 1 and MI 3) • At least 51 hectares land deliverable in five years at any one time (MI 4 and MI 5) • Increase in numbers and density of businesses, jobs, residents in employment, household income, educational attainment (MI 7, 8,9, 12, 14, 102 and 103) • Decrease in numbers of residents on out of work benefits, poverty levels, 16-18 year olds not in education, employment or training (MI 15, 16, 101, 104 and 105)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer / landowner intentions • Land / premises availability assessment • NPPF paragraphs 22 and 51 pose a risk to this policy if development does not come forward in the short / medium term or if an over-riding local need for housing arises • Completion rates do not meet required levels, resulting in an overall employment shortfall reducing the economic growth and competitiveness of Knowsley.
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffer of employment sites being provided • Engagement with landowners, e.g. call for sites exercises • Spatial distribution of land supply for employment purposes is located in areas of proven developer interest for these purposes or accords with evidenced requirements • Viability caveats included in policy CS27
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent and significant under delivery e.g. over a five year period • Failure to provide 51 hectare deliverable supply <u>or</u> adequate range of sites as defined in policy CS4 (clause 4)

<p>POLICY OF KLPCS</p>	<p>CS4 Economy and Employment</p>
<p>POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support • Release of Green Belt land as employment land supply (see policy CS5) • Potential review of Plan •

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS5 Green Belt
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phasing of site release linked to policies CS3 and 4 – see above • Detailed boundaries set in site allocations process • Development management process • Monitoring and evidence collation
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	4, 5, 6, 30, 31, 32
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 51 hectares employment land deliverable in five years at any one time (MI 4 and MI 5) • At least 2250 dwellings deliverable within 5 years (with NPPF buffer)(MI 30 and MI 31)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to minimise impact of Green Belt release on regeneration objectives • Risks identified in relation to housing / employment land availability – see above
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of specific land supply and phasing requirements – policies CS3 and CS4 • Progression of allocations via the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Regular monitoring and updating of evidence in relation to land supply
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance and available land supply assessed according to triggers in policies CS3 and CS4
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phased release of Green Belt land for residential and employment development • Potential to vary the balance of use(s) in some "reserve" locations (as identified in paragraph 5.50 of the KLPCS) via the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Release of 'safeguarded' Green Belt land prior to 2028

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS6 Town Centres and Retail Strategy
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation and development management processes • Current planning permission and proven developer interest for major development in Kirkby town centre • Lower levels of investment in other centres to be delivered via mainly private sector led investment • Monitoring and review of evidence
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	49, 50,51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 106
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative distribution and phasing of comparison retail provision – see tables 5.3 and 5.4 of KLPCS (MI49, MI54 and MI55) • Indicative distribution of convenience retail provision –see table 5.5 of the KLPCS (MI49, MI54 and MI55) • Decrease in levels of vacant retail units in centres (MI 56) • Increase in retail expenditure retention and footfall in town centres (MI 51, 57 and 58)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer / landowner intentions • Completion rates never meet required levels, resulting in an overall shortfall in the quantity and range of retail and service provision in Knowsley’s town centres thereby undermining their performance in meeting local needs. • No alternative to locate significant retail development in Knowsley other than in town centres, whilst appropriately addressing local needs.
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive engagement with developers / landowners • Site deliverability / viability issues have influenced distribution of capacity proposed
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent and significant under delivery of retail development, e.g. over a five year period relative to MI49, MI54 and MI55 • Persistent poor performance against MI56 e.g. over a five year period
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these, e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support • Potential review of Plan

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS7 Transport Networks
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range of funding programmes available e.g. connected to Local Transport Plan to assist delivery of clauses 1 and 3 • Clause 2 and 4 of policy to be primarily delivered via development management and developer contributions processes • Other policies, procedures and plans
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 82, 83, 106, 108, 110, 113, 115
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of transport schemes in Knowsley etc. in accordance with the LTP (MI 64) • % new dwellings accessible by public transport, cycle and walking etc. in accordance with the "Ensuring a Choice of Travel" SPD/LTP (MI 70) • Maintain number of Air Quality Management Areas at zero (MI 82) • Decrease in transport emissions, number of noise complaints and number of people killed/seriously injured in traffic accidents (MI 83 and MI 110) • Delivery of major infrastructure schemes as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (MI 115)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding of transport schemes where this has not already been committed • Ability to access capital funding to deliver larger infrastructure projects • Withdrawal of existing services could worsen accessibility by sustainable modes of travel • Economic conditions and market-led nature of some public transport provision
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint working on monitoring of Local Plan, LTP and IDP • Submission of funding bids as required • Local strategies for community transport
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non delivery of major infrastructure required to facilitate the delivery of the strategy • Persistent and significant poor or declining performance against target indicators
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted action to support infrastructure delivery e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support • Potential review of Plan • Regular monitoring and review of evidence

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS8 Green Infrastructure
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation and development management processes. • Public sector investment to support the priorities within the Knowsley Green Space Strategy, Liverpool City Region Green Infrastructure Framework and Mersey Forest Plan, as supported by evidence in the Greenspace Audit and Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy. • Assistance from funding for sustainable transport schemes e.g. Local Sustainable Transport Fund • Developer contributions
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	64, 65, 75, 76, 84, 86,87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 106, 108, 109
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of transport schemes in Knowsley etc. in accordance with the LTP (MI 64) • Increase river water quality and resident satisfaction with parks (MI 84 and MI 90) • Performance against quantitative standards set in tables 8.1 and 8.2 of KLPCS (MI86 and MI87) • Maintain or increase percentage of open space considered to be of good excellent quality etc. (MI 88)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variable provision across the Borough • Funding availability where this has not already been committed. • Pressure from development needs for housing and employment upon environmental and ecologically sensitive sites. • Reduced public sector resources available to deliver priorities.
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership working and consistency of priorities with Knowsley Greenspaces Strategy and Playing Pitch Assessment, Knowsley Green Space Strategy, Liverpool City Region Green Infrastructure Framework and Mersey Forest Plan to address specific areas of weakness, deficits and shortfalls • Submission of funding bids as required • Continue to liaise with sites owners to encourage greater management of ecologically important areas. • Preparation of additional Local Plan documents and supplementary guidance.
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent poor or declining performance against target indicators (MI86, MI87 and MI88). • Future Greenspace Audit or Playing Pitch Assessment could <u>potentially</u> find revisions to standards needed

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS8 Green Infrastructure
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted improvements to be included as investment priorities in the review of Knowsley’s Green Space Strategy. • Future review of standards through review of Local Plan.

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS9 Principal Regeneration Area – North Huyton and Stockbridge Village
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation, master planning and development management processes • Current planning permission and proven developer interest demonstrated by ongoing development • Public and private sector investment • Developer contributions
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	19, 30, 40, 41, 42, 43, 50
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy sets out guidance on mix of development in this area to include at least 1,450 dwellings (see paragraph 6.12 of KLPCS) • Contribution to achieving annual housing targets in MI19, and identification of housing land supply in MI30.
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer / landowner intentions • Non-delivery of housing development as the catalyst to meeting wider regeneration and development needs, including for affordable housing
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential transfer or release of remaining public sector assets • Comprehensive engagement with developers / landowners • Flexibility for changes in layout, density and capacity relative to existing commitment, including further master planning • Viability caveats included in policy CS27
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of links to persistent and significant under delivery and under performance e.g. over a five year period, against MI49, MI54 and MI55.
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support • Potential review of policy approach within Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of additional policy guidance within updated Supplementary Planning Document • Release of Green Belt land as housing land supply (see policy CS5) • Potential review of Plan

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS10 Principal Regeneration Area – Kirkby Town Centre
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation and development management processes • Current planning permission and proven developer interest for major development in Kirkby town centre • Public and private sector investment. • Developer contributions
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	4, 40, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56 57, 58
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy sets out guidance on mix of development in this area • Indicative amount and phasing of new comparison retail floorspace to be as set out in tables 5.3 and 5.4 of the KLPCS • Indicative amount of new convenience retail floorspace to be as set out in table 5.5 of the KLPCS • Increased retail expenditure retention and footfall (MI 51 and 57) • Proportion of vacant retail units within Kirkby Town Centre (MI56)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer/ landowner intentions • Non-delivery of retail development as the catalyst to meeting wider regeneration needs • There is no alternative for large scale retail investment in Kirkby, or to locate such a town centre development elsewhere in the Borough
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive engagement with developers / landowners • Site deliverability / viability issues have influenced distribution of development • Flexibility for alternative approaches to the existing commitment if required • Viability caveats included in policy CS27
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of links to persistent and significant under delivery of retail e.g. over a five year period, against MI49, MI54 and MI55. • Persistent poor performance of Kirkby Town Centre against MI56.

<p>POLICY OF KLPCS</p>	<p>CS10 Principal Regeneration Area – Kirkby Town Centre</p>
<p>POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support. • Potential review of policy approach within Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of additional policy guidance within Supplementary Planning Document • Potential review of Plan

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS11 Principal Regeneration Area: Knowsley Industrial and Business Parks
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocations and development management processes • Current planning permission and proven developer interest demonstrated by historic and ongoing development • Public and private sector investment • Developer contributions and Local Development Orders
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	1, 3, 4, 40, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 79, 80, 81
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy sets out guidance on mix of development in this area and priorities for employment development. • Contribution to achieving annual employment targets in MI 1 and MI 3.
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer/ landowner intentions • Land/premises availability assessment
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffer of employment sites being provided • Engagement with landowners e.g. call for sites exercises • Viability caveats included in policy CS27
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of links to persistent and significant under delivery and under performance e.g. over a five year period, against MI 1, MI 3 relative to MI44 and MI46.
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support • Potential review of policy approach within Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of additional policy guidance within Supplementary Planning Document • Release of Green Belt land as employment land supply (see policy CS5) • Potential review of Plan

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS12 Principal Regeneration Area – Tower Hill
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council’s land disposal programme • Site allocation, master planning and development management processes • Public and private sector investment. • Developer contributions.
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	4, 19, 40, 41, 42, 43, 49, 50
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy sets out guidance on mix of development in this area which is to include at least 300 dwellings (see paragraph 6.35 of KLPCS) • Contribution to achieving annual housing targets in MI19, and identification of housing land supply in MI30.
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer / landowner intentions
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing release of public sector assets • Comprehensive engagement with potential developers • Flexibility for layout, density and capacity relative to further master planning • Viability caveats included in policy CS27
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of links to persistent and significant under delivery and under performance e.g. over a five year period, against MI49, MI54 and MI55.
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support. • Potential review of policy approach within Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of additional policy guidance within updated Supplementary Planning Document • Release of Green Belt land as housing land supply (see policy CS5) • Potential review of Plan

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS13 Principal Regeneration Area – South Prescot
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation, master planning and development management processes • Current planning permission and proven interest for development in South Prescot. • Private sector investment. • Developer contributions.
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	1, 3, 4, 19, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 50
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy sets out guidance on mix of development in this area • Contribution to achieving annual employment targets in MI 1 and MI 3, and / or housing targets in MI19 and identification of housing land supply in MI30.
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer / landowner intentions
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement with landowners e.g. call for sites exercises • Planned flexibility for either housing or employment development • Necessary headroom in strategy to account for loss of employment land • Site deliverability / viability issues have influenced distribution of development • Viability caveats included in policy CS27
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of links to persistent and significant under delivery and under performance e.g. over a five year period, against MI1, MI3 and / or MI19, via MI40 – MI46.
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support • Potential review of policy approach within Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of additional policy guidance within Supplementary Planning Document • Release of Green Belt land as employment land supply (see policy CS5) • Potential review of Plan

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS14 Principal Regeneration Area – Prescott Town Centre
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation, master planning and development management processes. • Current planning permission on Sewell Street. • Public and private sector investment. • Developer contributions. • Prescott Townscape Heritage Initiative • Prescott Town Centre Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	4, 40, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy sets out guidance on mix of development in this area • Indicative amount and phasing of new comparison retail floorspace to be as set out in tables 5.3 and 5.4 of the KLPCS • Increased retail expenditure retention and footfall (MI 51 and 57) • Proportion of vacant retail units within Prescott Town Centre (MI56)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer/ landowner intentions • Non-delivery of retail development as the catalyst to meeting wider regeneration needs • Prescott Town Centre Conservation Area continues to be included on the English Heritage ‘at risk’ register
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy emphasis upon improvements to Prescott Town Centre (including Prescott Conservation Area) • Engagement with landowners e.g. call for sites exercises • Site deliverability / viability issues have influenced distribution of development • Flexibility for alternative approaches to the existing commitment if required • Viability caveats included in policy CS27
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of links to persistent and significant under delivery of retail e.g. over a five year period, against MI49, MI54 and MI55 • Persistent poor performance of Prescott Town Centre against MI56
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS14 Principal Regeneration Area – Prescott Town Centre
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential review of policy approach within Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of additional policy guidance within Supplementary Planning Document • Potential review of Plan

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS15 Delivering Affordable Housing
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management process • Developer contributions • Preparation of supplementary guidance and evidence • Partnership working with Registered Providers
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 33, 34, 35, 36, 113, 114
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific target for overall amount of affordable housing (MI 22-23) but policy requires 25% provision on market sector sites subject to provisos including viability (MI 24) • Decrease in empty homes (MI 26) • Increase in empty homes brought back into use (MI 27) • Decreases in choice based letting demands, persons registered as homeless and households in fuel poverty (MI 34, MI 35 and MI37)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing needs become even more pressing due to the increasing and unmet demand, resulting in overcrowded households. • Residents moving out of the Knowsley to access affordable housing elsewhere with knock-on effects such as longer commuting patterns and more traffic, decline in the local economy, and, in extreme cases, homelessness. • Economic trends, meaning viability affects ability to meet the requirements of the policy
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy inclusion of flexibility for lower proportions of affordable housing requirements where viability dictates. • Viability caveats included in policy CS15 and linking to policy CS27 • Viability evidence to be regularly updated.
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant and persistent failure by market housing developers to deliver affordable housing • Revised viability evidence indicates that the percentage sought is no longer viable for all developments
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential review of percentage stated in policy • Provision of further or revised supplementary guidance

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS16 Specialist and Supported Accommodation
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management processes • Council policies, procedures and plans, including Housing Strategy • Partnership working across public and private sector agencies
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	28
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific target identified
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of cooperation from partners, affecting joint working and preparation of integrated strategies • Partner, developer and landowner intentions • Provision of inadequate specialist and supported accommodation if policy is not applied consistently
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive joint working by the Council • Consider need for more detailed policy guidance for specialist and supported accommodation
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant and persistent delivery of unsuitable accommodation • Emerging evidence indicating a need for more detailed policy guidance
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review policy approach through the Local Plan • Provision of more detailed policy guidance • Greater emphasis on joint working with key partners

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS17 Housing Sizes and Design Standards
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management processes • Developer contributions • Preparation of supplementary guidance
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	18, 25, 37, 59
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease in numbers of households in fuel poverty (MI 37) • Indicative mix of dwelling sizes on <u>current</u> evidence identified in KLPCS table 7.1 (new evidence will be reviewed as Plan period progresses)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial changes to government-endorsed guidance for residential design standards • Emergence of new evidence which significantly changes the mix of housing sizes required • Economic trends, affecting development viability and compromising design quality of new residential development
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy inclusion of flexibility on meeting design standards and dwelling size mix • Review of endorsed design standards undertaken regularly and recognition that these may change
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary to reflect radical change to recognised design standards or evidence regarding the delivery required to meet design standards
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Policy approach through the Local Plan • Provision of more detailed policy guidance

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS18 Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers etc.
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management processes • Site allocations process • Collation of evidence • Public and/or private sector investment • Council plans, procedures and plans
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	29, 59, 70
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of provision will be determined in Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies, including accommodation targets (MI 29). • % new dwellings accessible by public transport, cycle and walking etc. in accordance with the "Ensuring a Choice of Travel" SPD/LTP (MI 70)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer / landowner intentions • Difficulties in identifying a site or sites to accommodate accommodation targets • Revised evidence indicates requirement to change accommodation targets over the plan period • Change in government policy regarding the provision of accommodation for travellers
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target-setting and site allocations undertaken through Local Plan process, including assessments, consultation and examination • Evidence collated on sub-regional basis • Regular review of government guidance and policy
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor performance against targets (once set), including inability to identify appropriate supply of accommodation
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review targets / allocations through the Local Plan • Provision of more detailed policy guidance

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS19 Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre application engagement • Development management process • Master planning process
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	37, 90, 105, 106, 112
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local targets for number of appeals upheld (MI 112) • Decrease in numbers of households in fuel poverty and crime levels (MI 37 and MI 105)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends • Viability • Developer / landowner intentions • Failure to deliver high quality, appropriately designed schemes across should this policy not be applied consistently.
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy incorporates criteria which will ensure Knowsley’s existing built and natural environment is complemented through seeking high quality design • Design requirements have been viability assessed by evidence.
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of a number of appeal decisions upheld for design reasons when analysing MI112.
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review policy approach through Local Plan. • Consider the need for an associated SPD to provide detailed guidance.

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS20 Managing the Borough’s Historic Environment
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation and development management processes. • Public and private sector investment • Conservation Area Management Plans • Prescott Town Centre Townscape Heritage Initiative
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	60, 61, 62, 63, 106
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease / maintain at zero numbers of historic assets and Conservation Areas at risk (MI 60 and MI 61)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer / landowner intentions • Pressure from development needs. • Historic assets included on the English Heritage ‘at risk’ register
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy approach which provides proportionate protection for historic assets based upon their significance.
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any poor performance against MI60 and MI61 identified on an annual basis.
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond to historic assets and Conservation Areas at risk with targeted action to resolve any issues.

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS21 Greenspaces and Trees
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation and development management processes • Public sector investment to support the priorities within the Knowsley Green Space Strategy, Liverpool City Region Green Infrastructure Framework and Mersey Forest Plan, as supported by evidence in the Greenspace Audit and Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy • Assistance from funding for sustainable transport schemes e.g. Local Sustainable Transport Fund • Developer contributions
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 108
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance against quantitative standards set in tables 8.1 and 8.2 of KLPCS (MI86 and MI87) • Maintain or increase percentage of open space considered to be of good excellent quality etc. (MI 88) • Increase in resident satisfaction with parks and open spaces (MI 90)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variable existing provision across Borough • Pressure to release greenspace for other uses such as development needs for housing and employment • Reduced public sector resources available to deliver priorities within local standards • Deliverability of quantitative improvements increasingly reliant upon development contribution or on-site provision
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy approach focussing upon retaining priority greenspaces based upon quantity, quality and accessibility • Joint working with Knowsley Green Space Strategy and Playing Pitch Assessment to address shortfalls • Submission of funding bids as required
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent poor or declining performance against target indicators (MI86, MI87 and MI88) • Future Greenspace Audit or Playing Pitch Assessment could potentially find revisions to standards needed
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of reasons for under delivery and targeted action to address these e.g. release of public sector assets, land assembly, public sector funding support • Future review of standards through review of Local Plan

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS22 Sustainable and Low Carbon Development
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management processes • Preparation of supplementary guidance and evidence • Developer contributions via Allowable Solutions, including potential Community Energy Fund
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	37, 47, 48, 59, 79, 80, 81, 109
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease in numbers of households in fuel poverty (MI 37)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial changes to government guidance for design standards. • Economic trends, affecting development viability and compromising design quality of new development • Developer/ landowner intentions
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced approach to delivery of pre-application advice • Review of design standards undertaken regularly and recognition that these may change
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant and persistent delivery of unsustainable development • Emerging evidence indicating a new policy approach and/or more detailed policy guidance
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential review of policy approach within Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of additional policy guidance within Supplementary Planning Document

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS23 Renewable and Low Carbon Infrastructure
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management processes • Preparation of supplementary guidance • Developer contributions via Allowable Solutions, including potential Community Energy Fund • Energy Services Companies
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	37, 47, 48, 79, 81
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease in number of households in fuel poverty (MI 37)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic trends and changes to public sector subsidy, affecting the viability of renewable and low carbon installations
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced approach to delivery of pre-application advice • Review of public sector funding availability undertaken regularly and recognition that this may change
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerging evidence indicating a new policy approach, more detailed policy guidance or site-specific allocations
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review policy approach and/or site allocations through the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of more detailed guidance within a Supplementary Planning Document

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS24 Managing Flood Risk
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management processes • Collation of flood risk assessment evidence • Public and private sector investment
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	75, 76, 77
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target of 0 applications per annum granted contrary to Environment Agency advice (M1 75)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates to Environment Agency Flood Maps resulting in increased areas of flood risk • Developer and landowner intentions • Economic trends, affecting development viability and compromising deliverability of SuDS assets
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of flood risk information • Review of Environment Agency Flood Maps undertaken regularly and recognition that these may change
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient development land available within suitable locations outside areas of significant flood risk
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review policy approach through the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of more detailed guidance within a Supplementary Planning Document • Allocation of alternative development locations via Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of more detailed policy guidance and/or master planning of specific sites

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS25 Management of Mineral Resources
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management processes • Private sector investment
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	71, 72, 73
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific target identified
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer and landowner intentions • Inadequate production of primary land won aggregates • Inadequate production of secondary and recycled aggregates
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider need for more detailed policy guidance
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant and persistent under delivery of primary, secondary or recycled aggregates • Emerging evidence indicating a need for more detailed policy guidance and/or Mineral Safeguarding Areas
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review policy approach through Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies • Provision of more detailed policy guidance • Identification of Mineral Safeguarding Areas via Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS26 Waste Management
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the policies within the Merseyside and Halton Joint Waste Local Plan • Development management processes • Public and private sector investment
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	74, 85, 91
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Merseyside and Halton Joint Waste Local Plan – Table 6.3, page 91—93 (MI 85)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure in application of the Waste Local Plan policies • Provision of unsustainable forms of waste management
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of Waste Local Plan policies relating to waste facility safeguarding and site prioritisation (WM1-7) and relating to design and sustainability (WM0, WM8-16) • Regular review of evidence and monitoring information
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant and persistent failure to meet targets prescribed in Waste Local Plan (see above)
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the Plan to change or strengthen policies

POLICY OF KLPCS	CS27 Planning and Paying for New Infrastructure
PRIMARY DELIVERY MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development management process (including assessments and developer contributions) • Preparation of supplementary guidance • Public and private sector investment
MONITORING INDICATORS (MI)	23, 24, 29, 40, 47, 48, 59, 64 , 65, 69, 70 , 80, 91, 92, 96, 113, 114, 115
TARGETS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of transport schemes in Knowsley etc. in accordance with the LTP (MI 64) • % new dwellings accessible by public transport, cycle and walking etc. in accordance with the "Ensuring a Choice of Travel" SPD/LTP (MI 70) • Delivery of major infrastructure schemes as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (MI 115)
KEY RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty regarding availability of public and private sector funding for infrastructure • Economic trends and viability • Developer and landowner intentions • Impact of CIL regulations and other government-led changes on preparation of supplementary guidance
MITIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible approach in the KLPCS to policy guidance for developer contributions • Flexible approach to account for challenging economic circumstances and development viability • Ability to refresh Infrastructure Delivery Plan content
TRIGGERS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant and persistent under provision of infrastructure, detrimentally affecting new development • Review of evidence base and IDP
POTENTIAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Local Plan policy • Provision of supplementary guidance

Notes

1. Indicators which are marked in **bold** in the table above are Core Indicators as defined in the Monitoring Framework (SD15).
2. The table contains amendments to the monitoring framework as follows:
 - MI112 "number of appeals upheld" also applies to policy SD1 and will have a local target set
 - Indicators MI 49,50 and 51 also apply to policy CS6

For more information log on to
www.knowsley.gov.uk/LocalPlan

You can also get this information in other formats.
Please phone Customer Services on 0151 443 4031
or email [customer](mailto:customer@knowsley.gov.uk) [@knowsley.gov.uk](mailto:customer@knowsley.gov.uk)