



Wigan♥
Council

Wigan Borough Local Plan

Route Mapper Toolkit

Part 4:

Local Plan Soundness and Quality Assessment

Author: Strategic Planning

Date: August 2026

1. The toolkit

- 1.1 The Route Mapper Toolkit Part 4: Local Plan Soundness and Quality Assessment has been developed by the Planning Advisory Service. The purpose of the toolkit is to provide a 'mock' examination, as far as that is possible, of your local plan. It is intended to be particularly helpful for use as part of the development of the emerging local plan and as a final check prior to publication of the Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan.

2. Using the toolkit

- 2.1 The assessment includes 50 key questions in the matrix below. The Council has considered and provided an answer to each of the questions, cross referencing to evidence and providing justification where necessary. Based on this assessment, the Council has attributed a score ranging from -2 to +2 depending on our confidence on how the Local Plan meets plan requirements.

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment
	Growth Strategy	
A	In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) summarise your strategy for delivering growth and development in your area	Wigan Borough's growth strategy focuses on creating fair opportunities and thriving places through the delivery of sustainable housing, jobs and infrastructure to 2039. Growth is concentrated in key locations, particularly the NorthFold Growth Location, with major housing and employment allocations supported by new transport links, community facilities and green infrastructure. The strategy prioritises protection of employment areas, town centre renewal, affordable housing, improved connectivity, high-quality design and environmental enhancement, whilst safeguarding the borough's natural and historic assets and supporting the transition to a low-carbon economy.
B	In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) identify the key factors which informed the distribution of development in the local plan update	The distribution of development was informed by the need to meet the borough's housing and employment requirements, maximising the use of existing commitments and deliverable sites outside of the Green Belt, supporting regeneration, and aligning growth with strategic infrastructure investment. A strong emphasis is placed on the NorthFold Growth Location, reflecting its role in the Places for Everyone Plan and its capacity to accommodate housing, jobs and major transport improvements. Site selection was also shaped by evidence relating to housing need, economic growth, infrastructure capacity, environmental constraints, flood risk, accessibility, and the protection of the borough's natural and historic assets.
C	List each of the main growth areas and strategic sites and the key infrastructure needed to support delivery	1. NorthFold Growth Location (Wigan-Bolton Growth Corridor) The principal focus for growth in the borough, providing around 77% of the residual housing requirement and significant employment opportunities. Alongside the allocation at West of Gibfield in the PfE Plan (Policy JP Allocation 34), the Local Plan proposes key allocations at North Leigh Park, South Hindley, South of Atherton, East of Atherton and Westwood Park within this growth corridor.

		North Leigh Park (around 1,500 homes) Key infrastructure: • A578 Leigh Road to A579 Atherleigh Way link road • New local centre • Bus, walking, wheeling and cycling connections • Strategic green infrastructure and flood mitigation • Education, health, community and recreation infrastructure • Potential minewater heat network South Hindley (up to 2,000 homes) Key infrastructure: • South Hindley Link Road between A58 Liverpool Road and A578 Leigh Road • New local centre • Flood management measures • Green infrastructure network including Leyland Park enhancements • Health, education, community and recreation facilities • Potential minewater heat network South of Atherton (around 270 homes) Key infrastructure: • Completion of the Leigh Road to Tyldesley Road link road • Natural flood management measures • Green infrastructure along Chanters Brook • Walking, wheeling and cycling links • Education, health and community infrastructure contributions
--	--	---

		East of Atherton (around 600 homes and 5,500 sqm employment) Key infrastructure: • Access from A579 Bolton Road • Improvements to Atherton Station access and nearby bus facilities • Green infrastructure corridor separating housing and employment uses • Sustainable drainage systems • Community infrastructure contributions Westwood Park (around 420 homes and 16,800 sqm employment) Key infrastructure: • High quality green infrastructure linked to Westwood Flash and the canal • Walking, wheeling and cycling connections to Wigan town centre • Public rights of way enhancements • Health, education and recreation infrastructure contributions 2. Landgate, Ashton-in-Makerfield (around 500 homes) Key infrastructure: • Extension of Bryn Green Avenue linking A49 Wigan Road and B5207 Bryn Road • Retention/relocation of Landgate School and existing employment uses • Enhanced sports facilities and playing pitches • Active travel links to Bryn station, local centre and employment areas • Community infrastructure contributions Borough-Wide Strategic Infrastructure Priorities: The Local Plan identifies several strategic schemes required to support growth:
--	--	---

		• Wigan Station Gateway • Golborne Station • Improvements to Atherton rail services • Improvements to the Kirkby rail line • Enhanced rapid transit services to/from Leigh • M58 Link Road • Wigan-Hindley Link Road • South Hindley Link Road • North Leigh Park Link Road • Gibfield Park Way Extension • West of Gibfield-Lee Hall Link • A577 and A58 Active Travel and Public Transport Improvements • Lane Head South Relief Road Together these schemes provide the transport, community, environmental and utility infrastructure required to support the Local Plan's housing, employment and regeneration strategy				
1.	Overall does the local plan update clearly articulate the strategy for <u>where</u> and <u>how</u> sustainable development will be delivered and that this is 'an appropriate strategy' within the context of paragraph 36 of the NPPF?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: In combination with the adopted Places for Everyone Plan, the Local Plan clearly articulates both <i>where</i> and <i>how</i> sustainable development will be delivered and constitutes an “appropriate strategy” for the purposes of paragraph 36 of the NPPF. In terms of where development will be delivered, the plan establishes a clear spatial strategy focused on the NorthFold Growth Location, which accommodates the majority of the borough's housing growth through large allocations at North Leigh Park, South Hindley, South of Atherton, East of Atherton and Westwood Park. It also				

		identifies the employment growth locations, town centres, employment areas and environmental assets that shape the overall pattern of development. In terms of how development will be delivered, the plan links growth to specific infrastructure requirements, including strategic transport schemes, local centres, education, health provision, green infrastructure, flood mitigation and developer contributions. The allocation policies contain detailed site-specific delivery requirements and phasing expectations, demonstrating how development will be supported by infrastructure and environmental mitigation. The strategy is also supported by a comprehensive evidence base, including housing, employment, transport, infrastructure, viability, flood risk, nature recovery, retail and open space studies. It aligns with the adopted Places for Everyone Plan, identifies sufficient land to meet housing and employment requirements, and includes monitoring and an early review mechanism. Given the housing requirement is set in the PfE Plan, and that all the developable sites within the borough's housing land supply have a role in addressing this, the Sustainability Appraisal concluded that there were no reasonable alternative growth scenarios in relation to housing that did not rely upon Green Belt release.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move score to right: N/A				
2.	Is it clear how the amount of development identified for any growth areas or major site allocations has been determined – and that the level proposed is deliverable / developable and justified?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: We consider the Local Plan provides a clear and evidence-based justification for the amount of development proposed within the main growth areas and strategic allocations and explains why those levels are considered deliverable and developable.				

		The housing requirement is derived from the adopted Places for Everyone (PfE) Plan, which sets a requirement of 16,527 homes between 2022 and 2039, equivalent to 972 dwellings per annum. The plan then demonstrates how this requirement will be met through completions, PfE allocations, Local Plan allocations, SHLAA sites and windfall allowances. A total supply of 19,148 homes is identified, providing a flexibility margin above the requirement. For the six strategic housing allocations, the plan explains the anticipated capacity of each site and the evidence informing those capacities. The plan is supported by site allocation assessment reports, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Local Housing Needs Assessment, Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Flood Risk Evidence Assessment, Viability Assessment, and other technical studies that are specifically referenced as part of the evidence base supporting the allocations and overall strategy. Similarly, employment growth is linked to the PfE Plan requirement for at least 482,326 sqm of employment floorspace, with the plan identifying a supply of approximately 486,978 sqm and explaining the contribution made by allocated sites, employment areas and committed developments.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
3.	Is it clear that the local plan update provides for the minimum number of homes required informed by a local housing need assessment undertaken utilising the standard method set out in the PPG? Have any unmet needs arising from neighbouring areas been	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The plan is explicit that it is being examined against the December 2023 NPPF and is relying on the housing requirement established through the adopted Places for Everyone (PfE) Plan, rather than a housing need figure derived from the newer standard method. The introduction chapter states that the plan provides a policy framework to deliver the PfE housing requirement to				

	taken into account when establishing the amount of housing to be planned for?	2039 and therefore falls within the transitional arrangements in paragraph 234(c) of the December 2024 NPPF. The Local Plan therefore plans for 16,527 homes between 2022 and 2039 (972 dwellings per annum), which is the PfE requirement for Wigan rather than a locally derived standard method figure. The Local Housing Needs Assessment is used primarily to inform the type, size, tenure and specialist housing needs of future housing provision rather than to establish the overall housing requirement. Consequently, for soundness purposes, it is clear that the Plan provides for the minimum housing requirement that currently applies through the adopted strategic planning framework, but it is not based on a fresh standard-method housing need assessment undertaken for the Local Plan Update itself. The Plan acknowledges this and commits to an early review, as set out in Policy R1, which will take into account of updated housing needs from March 2029. Our DtC Statement of Common Ground confirms no unmet needs from neighbouring districts. Implications of taking no further action: None Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: We have done all we can by committing to an early review of the Local Plan so that it is sufficiently progressed by March 2029 when the protections from a higher housing requirement provided by the adoption of the PfE Plan is lifted.				
4.	Is the distribution of development justified in respect of the need for, and approach to, Green Belt release and can you demonstrate that alternatives to Green Belt release have been fully considered? Can you demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to justify green belt release in the context	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan does not propose Green Belt release.				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				

	of paragraphs 146 and 147 of the NPPF? If Green Belt land is to be released for development has priority been given to previously developed land, followed by grey belt which is not previously developed, followed by other Green Belt locations?					
5.	Is it clear how sites have been selected and have site allocations been made on a consistent basis having regard to the evidence base, including housing and employment land availability assessments, the Sustainability Appraisal and viability assessment? If not, can you justify why?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan provides a clear and consistent explanation of how sites have been selected and demonstrates that allocations have been informed by the evidence base, including the SHLAA, EMELA, Integrated Assessment, infrastructure evidence, flood risk evidence and viability testing. The Plan explicitly states that it is supported by: • A SHLAA identifying deliverable and developable housing land. • An Economic Market and Employment Land Assessment informing employment land needs. • An Integrated Assessment incorporating Sustainability Appraisal, Equality Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessment. • A Local Plan Viability Assessment assessing the cumulative impact of policy requirements.				

		- Site Allocation Assessment Reports for each allocation covering deliverability, site conditions, flood risk, transport, environmental impacts and, where relevant, Green Belt matters. All developable and suitable sites allocated in the PfE Plan and identified in the SHLAA are included within the housing land supply for the plan period. The six proposed housing allocations represent the larger strategic sites within the land supply that will benefit from a strategic policy framework, to facilitate the delivery of associated infrastructure etc. They are: - Located within or adjoining existing urban areas. - Well related to the NorthFold Growth Location and the Places for Everyone spatial strategy. - Supported by identified transport and infrastructure interventions. - Accompanied by comprehensive site-specific requirements addressing infrastructure, flood risk, biodiversity, remediation and accessibility.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
6.	Does the local plan update identify a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The 3 Neighbourhood Plans within Wigan Borough, for Standish, Abram and Golborne and Lowton West, have already been made, and do not include policies which principally limit new housing development in their areas. Housing requirements for these designated Neighbourhood Areas are not considered to be required. The housing land supply includes land in each of the Neighbourhood Areas.				

		Implications of taking no further action: Potential challenge at examination that the plan does not identify housing requirements for the adopted Neighbourhood Plans.				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move score to right: None. We consider it unnecessary to identify requirements for already made plans that do not principally limit new housing development in their areas.				
7.	Do site allocations include sufficient detail on the mix and quantum of development, including, where appropriate any necessary supporting infrastructure?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The site allocation policies are clear on the mix and quantum of development required, and any necessary supporting infrastructure. For housing, this includes an appropriate mix of house types, sizes and tenures and 25% affordable housing. The allocation policies can be applied alongside other relevant policies in the Local Plan, notably Policy H2 which requires an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes, tenures and affordability. The allocations identify site-specific infrastructure requirements including: • Strategic highway links and access arrangements. • New local centres at North Leigh Park and South Hindley. • Walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport connections. • Education, health, community, open space, sport and recreation infrastructure. • Green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancements. • Flood mitigation and sustainable drainage measures. • Land remediation and treatment of former mining impacts.				

		Utility and energy infrastructure, including investigation of minewater heat networks on some sites.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
D	What targets have you set for non-residential floorspace or employment land and, if relevant, the number of jobs to be created over the plan period? List these targets and the evidence source for this 'need' target?	Policy J1 commits the borough to identifying sufficient land to deliver at least 482,326 sqm of employment floorspace between 2022 and 2039. This reflects the borough's expected contribution towards the employment requirement across nine Greater Manchester districts as set in policies JP-J3 and JP-J4 of the Places for Everyone Plan. The evidence sources are primarily the Places for Everyone Plan and the Wigan EMELA (2024).				
8.	Where and how are the targets referred to above to be delivered? Do the sites and indicative capacities that you have identified demonstrate that these targets are achievable?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The sources of this delivery are set out in Policy J1, with the case for their deliverability set out in the Jobs Topic Paper, which is consistent with PfE Employment Land Supply monitoring.				
		Implications of taking no further action: While we can meet the quantitative target set out in the PfE Plan there are concerns about the quality of some of the sites in the current land not being in the right locations and not meeting the requirements of modern business.				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: We have committed to a review of our employment land supply alongside the requirement to review the housing requirement, which is reflected in policies J1 and H1 and with Policy R1 committing to an early review of the plan from March 2029.				

9.	Does the local plan update: (i) identify infrastructure that is necessary to support planned growth; and (ii) enable provision of this infrastructure?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which, as far as practicable, identifies the type of infrastructure and specific infrastructure projects required to support growth over the plan period, the organisations responsible for delivery, when the infrastructure is required, cost and funding mechanisms. The infrastructure requirements are embedded throughout both the strategic policies and individual site allocation policies in the Local Plan. These include: • Transport infrastructure: Primarily by Policy TI which safeguards land to facilitate the delivery of various future transport priorities. • Social infrastructure: Primarily by policy PE6 which sets a policy framework to accrue developer contributions for a range of infrastructure including health, education, community provision and open space, sport and play provision. • Utilities and energy infrastructure: Including water and wastewater, digital and telecommunications, renewable and low carbon energy, and minewater heat network investigations on former coalfield sites. • Allocation-specific infrastructure: Each strategic allocation policy contains bespoke infrastructure requirements, such as new local centres, highway improvements, flood mitigation works, remediation strategies, active travel connections and community infrastructure. The Local Plan provides clear mechanisms to enable delivery, principally through Policy PE6, site-specific allocation requirements, developer contributions, infrastructure-led masterplanning and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				

		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
10.	Can you demonstrate that the transport and other infrastructure needed to support <u>each</u> growth area or strategic site identified in the local plan update: (i) can be funded and delivered; and (ii) is supported by the relevant providers/ delivery agents in terms of funding and timescales indicated? Have you identified the extent of any funding gap? If so, are you able to explain why you are confident that any gap can be addressed?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Council's position is that the infrastructure required to support the proposed growth areas and strategic sites is deliverable and can be funded over the plan period. The draft Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2050 and Delivery Plan sets out the long-term transport interventions and investment priorities required to support sustainable growth across Wigan Borough and Greater Manchester. This provides a strategic framework for transport infrastructure delivery alongside Local Plan growth. Site-specific requirements have been identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and supporting evidence. Funding is expected to come from a combination of developer contributions and Greater Manchester and Government funding programmes. Whilst some longer-term infrastructure schemes are dependent on future funding decisions and therefore cannot yet be regarded as fully committed, this is not unusual for a plan of this timescale. Any funding gap identified is not considered to undermine the deliverability of the Plan, as infrastructure will be delivered progressively alongside development, with opportunities to secure developer contributions and external funding through established investment programmes and bidding processes. The Council is therefore satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect that the necessary infrastructure can be funded and delivered within the plan period.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				

Process and Outcomes (see also Toolkit Parts 2 and 3)		
E	What are the cross boundary strategic matters affecting your local plan update? List these.	The cross boundary strategic matters are set out in Table 2 of our Duty to Cooperate Statement of Common Ground and are as follows: • Impact of Local Plan policies on school places • Impact of Local Plan policies on healthcare facilities • Identifying sufficient land to meet Wigan Borough's housing needs as set out in the PFE Plan • Meeting the need for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople accommodation • Impacts of the housing allocation at East of Atherton • Identifying sufficient land to meet the Borough's need for employment sites / premises, as set out in the PFE Plan • Impact of the Local Plan end date of 31 March 2039 on cross-boundary land supplies for new homes and jobs • Impact of Local Plan policies on the strategic road network • Impact of Local Plan policies on the Key Route Network • Impact of Local Plan policies on walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport • Impact of Local Plan policies on the operational integrity or safety of aerodromes • Impact of Local Plan Town Centre policies on neighbouring town centres • Impacts of Local Plan policies on the Wigan-Bolton Growth Corridor (NorthFold) • Impact of Local Plan policies on water quality and water courses flowing into the borough and from the borough

		- Impacts of Local Plan policies on the GM Wetlands Nature Improvement Area - Impacts of Local Plan policies on Chat Moss - Impacts of Local Plan policies on strategic green infrastructure and nature recovery				
11.	Does your Duty to Cooperate Statement(s) of Common Ground: (i) identify these issues; (ii) identify the bodies you have engaged with or continue to engage with; and (iii) clearly set out not just the process, but the outcomes of this engagement highlighting areas of agreement and of difference?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) identifies the strategic issues in Section 7 and sets out the bodies that have been engaged with, or we continue to engage with, in relation to those issues. For each issue, the SoCG includes a box setting out the outcomes of this engagement. Sometimes no issues of concern have been raised with the council. In other cases, the SoCG highlights that we will continue to work with partners to address cross boundary issues. No major areas of difference have been identified.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
F	Are there any aspects of the local plan update not in conformity with national policy? Please set these out and provide justification with reference to evidence for these. Are you satisfied you can robustly defend this on the basis of local evidence? <i>For instance, are you seeking to require affordable housing on sites which are below the</i>	The following aspects of the Local Plan could be considered to be not fully in conformity with national planning policy: - Policy PE2: Hot food takeaways – The mandatory financial contribution of £50/sqm to help mitigate potential impact on nuisance and amenity in the local area, including litter bin maintenance and street cleaning. This approach has been applied effectively in the borough since 2004 in accordance with the Council’s Hot Food Establishments Supplementary Planning Document (2004). - Policy J3: EPC B requirements for employment development: The policy seeks EPC B ratings or better for business developments, subject to viability and feasibility. This goes beyond current national minimum energy efficiency				

	<i>threshold of major development as defined by national planning policy (other than in designated rural areas?)</i>	requirements but the policy benefits from viability safeguards, climate change evidence and also aligns with Greater Manchester's net zero objectives.				
12.	Are there any specific policies in the local plan update where there are differences to any policy approach set out in a relevant strategic planning framework (e.g. the London Plan, or a plan produced by a Combined Authority or through voluntary agreement).	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Plan has been prepared in accordance with, and complements, the Places for Everyone (PfE) Plan. It implements the PfE Plan at the borough level; adds locally specific policies where the PfE Plan is silent or provides only strategic direction; and introduces stronger local controls in some areas.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
13.	Is the local plan update: in conformity with any 'higher level' plans prepared by the Council; and properly reflecting provisions of any made neighbourhood plan?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: - The Local Plan is in conformity with the Places for Everyone Plan, and also explicitly aligned with Progress with Unity, the Council's movement for change. In addition, the plan also draws upon and supports the Wigan Borough Transport Strategy, the GM Local Nature Recovery Strategy, and the GM Strategy. - The Local Plan reflects provisions in the 3 made Neighbourhood Plans (Abram, Golborne and Lowton West, Standish) with some Neighbourhood Plan policies				

		being replaced by proposed policies in this plan, as set out in Appendix 4. The plan:				
		- o Continues to protect Local Green Spaces originally designated in Neighbourhood Plans - o Recognises neighbourhood plan designations as part of the development plan - o Does not allocate development on neighbourhood plan-protected land in a manner that would directly undermine adopted neighbourhood plan policies - o Through proposed Policy H9 ensures that Policy H1 of the Standish Neighbourhood Plan continues to operate effectively following the removal of safeguarded land designations				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
14.	Does your Consultation Statement demonstrate how you have complied with the specific requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement to date [you should revisit and update this following the publication of your Regulation 19 local plan update]?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: In our Regulation 22 Statement we have set out how we have complied with the 2012 Regulations at each consultation stage, both at Regulation 18 and 19, and we have provided detailed of this in our Consultation Log. The Log provides detail broken down in to 7 stages of the Local Plan's development, including 4 stages of consultation that we have undertaken and how at each stage we have complied with the requirements set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.				
		NEEDS UPDATING FOLLOWING REG 19 CONSULTATION				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				

15.	Has the Sustainability Appraisal – incorporating the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation - evaluated all reasonable alternatives? Is it clear why alternatives have not been selected?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes, the Integrated Assessment satisfies the SEA requirement to identify, describe and evaluate reasonable alternatives. It contains a structured appraisal of employment site and strategy alternatives, explains why housing alternatives were not considered reasonable, and provides a clear narrative showing how preferred options changed during plan preparation.				
		Whilst the absence of detailed alternative housing strategies may attract examination scrutiny, the IA provides a clear justification for the absence of detailed housing strategy alternatives based on the adopted Places for Everyone Plan, transitional national policy provisions and the absence of any identified need for further Green Belt release.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
16.	Does the Sustainability Appraisal adequately assess the likely significant effects of policies and proposals?	Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Integrated Assessment provides a proportionate and comprehensive assessment of the likely significant environmental, social and economic effects of the Local Plan's policies and proposals. It applies a clear, comprehensive and consistent sustainability framework, appraises strategic options and site allocations, considers cumulative effects, identifies mitigation measures, and explains how appraisal findings have informed the evolution of the Plan.				

		The appraisal primarily focuses on the spatial strategy as it is this that generates significant effects on the baseline with proportionate consideration given to the Local Plan thematic policies as these are less likely to generate significant effects.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
17.	Is it clear how the Sustainability Appraisal has influenced the local plan update including how any policies or site allocations have been amended as a result and does it show (and conclude) that the local plan update is an appropriate strategy?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Integrated Assessment clearly demonstrates how it has influenced the preparation of the Local Plan. It shows that the Council moved away from previously preferred employment growth options following appraisal, consultation and further consideration of strategic growth issues. The IA explains why alternatives were not selected, identifies the likely significant effects of policies and proposals, and demonstrates how mitigation has been incorporated into the Plan. Overall, the IA concludes that the submitted Local Plan is an appropriate strategy, delivering predominantly positive effects while avoiding the more significant environmental impacts associated with additional strategic Green Belt releases at this stage.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
18.	Is it clear how an Equalities Impact Assessment has influenced the local plan update?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Integrated Assessment demonstrates that equalities considerations have been embedded throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.				

		Equality impacts are assessed through a dedicated objective, with specific consideration given to protected characteristics, and a range of policies addressing affordable housing, accessibility, specialist accommodation, health, community infrastructure and access to services have been informed by equalities considerations.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
19.	Does the Habitats Regulations Assessment consider the local plan update in combination with other plans and projects?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes, the HRA contains an “In Combination Assessment” and identifies other relevant plans including the Places for Everyone Plan, Warrington Local Plan, St Helens Local Plan, West Lancashire Local Plan, Central Lancashire Local Plan, Sefton Coast-related plans, Greater Manchester Minerals and Waste DPDs, and other supplementary planning documents/local plans.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
20.	If the Habitats Regulations Assessment has identified, through ‘Appropriate Assessment’ that mitigation measures are required, does the local plan update adequately identify the measures required and the mechanisms for delivering them?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Mitigation measures and delivery mechanisms for air quality impacts on Manchester Mosses SAC have already been secured through the adopted Holcroft Moss SPD. With regards to water quality in the Mersey Estuary SPA/Ramsar we have had extensive engagement with United Utilities throughout development of the local plan including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Places for Everyone Plan Policy JP-D1: Infrastructure Implementation includes a				

		mechanism for ensuring that development does not lead to infrastructure capacity or reliability problems for new development and we have signed a Statement of Common Ground with United Utilities to ensure ongoing engagement as the plan is implemented.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
21.	Is it clear how the outcomes and conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment have influenced the local plan update?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: As highlighted in the questions above, existing mitigation and delivery mechanisms are already in place.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
	Housing Strategy					
22.	Can you demonstrate that the policies and proposed allocations in your local plan update meet your housing requirement in full and that this can be achieved as a minimum? If not [for instance, because another local authority has agreed to plan for your unmet need], can you explain and robustly justify why?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes. Policy H1 identifies a supply of homes that exceeds the remaining PfE Plan housing requirement to 2039. The identified housing land supply (as set out in the supporting text to Policy H1) has a deliverable capacity which exceeds the housing requirement and provides a sufficient flexibility allowance to allow for any non-delivery. It also includes over a five-year supply of specific deliverable sites.				

		Implications of taking no further action for local plan soundness and/or effectiveness: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
G	<i>Is there any unmet need in neighbouring areas that you have been formally asked to accommodate? If yes, then list the amount by each local authority area.</i>	No				
22.	Does your local plan update accommodate any of this unmet need where you can sustainably to do so?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: N/A				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
23.	Is there a housing trajectory which illustrates the expected rate of housing delivery and ensures the maintenance of a 5-year supply during the plan period?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
	Is your strategy for delivery and implementation clearly articulated and justified to support the trajectory?	Reason for score: A housing trajectory is shown in the supporting text to Policy H1. The strategy for delivery and implementation is articulated in the supporting text for Policy H1, the residential site allocation policies, the Homes Topic Paper and evidenced in the Wigan 2026 SHLAA.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				

24.	Can you confirm: (i) that the local plan update will provide for a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites on adoption; and (ii) that beyond this 5 year period sites are developable and (iii) if relevant, you have included a 5 or 20 percent buffer to deal with under-delivery.	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: i. The Local Plan identifies a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites at April 2026 and on future adoption. ii. Policy H1 identifies a sufficient supply of developable sites to meet needs across the plan period. iii. A buffer of 5 percent has been included, which is the appropriate buffer taking account of recent levels of housing delivery in the borough.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
25.	Does the level of supply provide any 'head room' (that is additional supply above that required) to enable you to react quickly to any unforeseen changes in circumstances and to ensure that the full requirement will be met during the plan period?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes, the level of supply provides sufficient 'headroom' as set out in Policy H1 and its supporting text. Including completions, a total supply of 19,296 homes has been identified, which exceeds the requirement for 16,527 homes over the plan period.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				

26.	Is the Council reliant on the delivery of any 'windfall' sites (sites not specifically identified in the development plan) during the plan period and if so, how many and when? Is there compelling evidence to confirm that such sites will continue to come forward?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: 6,909 homes are identified on sites allocated in the Local Plan and/or Places for Everyone Plan. In addition, there are approximately 4,564 further homes on sites that have planning permission or prior approval. As such, a supply of around 11,473 homes has been identified on allocated sites and sites where housing has been approved, which equates to 69% of the PfE requirement. Given 5,109 homes have already been completed since April 2022, this actually slightly exceeds our outstanding requirement of 11,418 homes to meet the PfE target.				
		In addition, a further 2,264 potential homes are identified on sites without planning permission (275 where approval is pending) with evidence to support their inclusion in the Local Plan, and a further 450 homes are anticipated via an evidenced small site windfall allowance. Around 81% of the total supply is on allocated sites or sites that have planning permission for residential development.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
27.	Does the local plan update make it clear what size, type and tenure of housing is required?	Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: This is set out clearly in Policy H2.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				

28.	Does the local plan update specifically address the needs of different groups in the community?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score:				
		Informed by the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment, the Local Plan addresses the housing needs of the following groups in the community:				
		• Older people (Policy H2) • People with disabilities (Policy H2) • Care Leavers (Policy H2) • People requiring affordable housing (Policy H2) • Looked After Children (Policy H11) • Gypsies and travellers (Policy H12) • Traveling showpeople (Policy H13)				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
29.	Can your affordable housing requirements, including any geographical variations, be justified?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The affordable housing requirement is informed by an up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment.				
	Does the local plan update provide for the delivery of the full need for affordable housing? If					

	not, can you explain and justify why?	In line with the Local Housing Needs Assessment, Policy H2 of the Local Plan requires developments of 10 homes or more to make provision for at least 25% affordable homes, subject to viability. This alone is unlikely to provide for the full need for affordable housing. However, as detailed in the Homes Topic Paper, affordable targets have been exceeded each year from 2017-2026, except for 2021/22 when delivery fell just short. Around 70% of all homes delivered since 2011 have been grant funded, including homes delivered directly by the council, with the remainder delivered largely through S106 agreements. Therefore, the council utilises a range of different sources to ensure affordable housing delivery targets are met and does not rely solely on homes delivered through S106 agreements.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
30.	Have the needs for travellers and travelling showpeople been adequately assessed in accordance with national policy and have they been based on robust evidence?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The needs of travellers and travelling showpeople have been adequately assessed in an up-to-date Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (travellers) and a Housing Needs Assessment (HNA).				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
	Does the local plan update make adequate provision for the identified needs?					

31.	Will the local plan update provide for a 5-year supply of deliverable travellers and travelling showpeople pitches to meet identified needs?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes. The Local Plan allocates a site for up to 20 gypsy and traveller pitches, on land owned by Wigan Council, which is sufficient to cater for short-term and longer-term identified needs.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
H	List any travellers and travelling showpeople sites identified to meet need and the timescales for their delivery	Little Lane, Pemberton, extension site – dialogue underway with current occupier to enable its use for traveller purposes in the short-term, subject to planning approval.				
	Justified approaches to plan policy and content					
32.	Where thresholds are set in policies which trigger specific policy requirements, are these thresholds justified by evidence and is this clear in the supporting text? [You may wish to check each policy setting a threshold]	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes, thresholds are generally derived from either national policy, local evidence studies, viability evidence, health evidence, housing needs evidence or transport evidence. These include: • Affordable housing (Policy H2): This applies a threshold of schemes of 10 dwellings or more. This aligns with the national definition of major development and is supported by housing and viability evidence.				

		• Wheelchair accessible homes (Policy H2): This requires 4% of new build homes on schemes of 20 homes or more to be wheelchair accessible in accordance with Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations. • Health Impact Assessments (Policy PE1): The distinction between larger developments requiring a full Health Impact Assessment and smaller major developments requiring a Planning for Health Checklist follows a proportionate, risk-based approach and is supported by the Plan's wider health evidence base. • Transport and parking requirements (Policies T2-T4): The Transport Assessment, Parking and Travel Plan thresholds are based on established transport planning practice and informed by transport evidence and consultation with TfGM. The thresholds are clearly set out in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan. • Hot food takeaways (Policy PE2): This includes thresholds in relation to childhood obesity rates, concentration levels of takeaways, and separation distances and clustering controls. Justification for these thresholds is set out clearly in the supporting text and in the People Topic Paper. • Open space and play provision in new developments (Policy PE5): This applies a threshold of 100 homes whereby proposals above the threshold are required to, with exception, provide open space and equipped play space on-site, and proposals below the threshold are required to provide an equivalent financial contribution towards off-site provision close by. • Houses in Multiple Occupation (Policy H10): This includes concentration controls and 'anti-sandwiching' requirements. Clear justification is provided in the supporting text and in the Homes Topic Paper. • Impact assessments for retail and leisure uses (Policy TC1): This applies thresholds informed an up-to-date and robust retail study on our town centres. • Convenience shops outside of designated centres (Policy TC14): This applies thresholds for new convenience stores of up to 150sqm, 150-600sqm and over 600sqm. These have been informed by an up-to-date and robust retail study on our town centres.
--	--	---

		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
33.	Does the local plan update avoid deferring details on strategic matters to other documents? If not, is it clear <i>why</i> matters will be covered in other Development Plan Documents or Supplementary Planning Documents and why this is appropriate?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan avoids inappropriate deferral of strategic matters to other documents. The principal strategic decisions relating to housing, employment, infrastructure, transport and environmental protection are contained within the Plan itself. Where additional detail is expected through masterplans, Supplementary Planning Documents or the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, these documents are intended to support implementation of established policies rather than determine strategic policy choices.				
		The main exception relates to longer-term growth and potential future strategic employment allocations, which are proposed to be considered through an early review of the Plan. The Integrated Assessment explains why this approach has been adopted and why it is considered appropriate in light of the adopted Places for Everyone Plan and current evidence base.				
34.	Where the local plan update defines a hierarchy do policies throughout the Plan consistently: (i) reflect this hierarchical approach; (ii) make clear the level of protection afforded to designations depending on their status within the hierarchy; and	Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Plan consistently applies its hierarchies across strategic and development management policies. For example:				

	(iii) is the approach consistent with National Policy? [For example, hierarchies could relate to nature conservation, heritage assets, town centres/retail, settlements.]	• Centres hierarchy: Policy TC1 identifies a hierarchy of centres, with Wigan Town Centre at the top of the hierarchy; then principal town centres; district centres; and local centres. Policies relating to retail, town centre uses and regeneration generally direct development according to the role and function of each centre, with larger-scale proposals expected to be focussed in higher-order centres. This reflects a hierarchical approach consistent with national policy. • Employment hierarchy: The plan distinguishes between strategic employment locations identified through the Places for Everyone Plan; designated Employment Areas; and other employment sites. Policies apply differing levels of protection and expectations according to the role and significance of the employment location. • Green and Environmental Assets: The Plan recognises varying levels of environmental designation, including internationally important sites; nationally designated sites; locally designated sites; and local wildlife and green infrastructure assets. The policy framework generally reflects the fact that higher-order designations attract stronger protection. The Local Plan applies a proportionate level of protection to the status of the designation within the hierarchy. For example: • Following the nationally recognised hierarchy of ecological designations and nature conservation protection (policy EN1) • Applying a locational hierarchy for delivering off-site Biodiversity Net Gain that is consistent with national policy (policy EN4) • Applying a sustainable urban drainage hierarchy for surface water run-off that is consistent with National Policy (policy EN10) • Reflecting the approach to the protection of heritage assets required by national planning policy (policies PL2-PL6) • For open space and green infrastructure, applying the highest level of protection to Local Green Space designations reflecting national policy expectations (policy PE4).
--	---	---

		i. The approach is consistent with national policy which expects plans to recognise the hierarchy of centres; distinguish between different environmental and heritage designations; and apply protection proportionate to significance.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
35.	Where policies seek to limit certain uses, is this justified by evidence and is the rationale clear in the supporting text to the policy and in the evidence. [For example, policies relating to town centres, employment or retail may seek to limit certain uses.]	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The following policies seek to limit certain uses: • Policy PE2: Hot food takeaways • Policy PE3: Gambling and short term loan establishments (PE3) • Policy PE8: Development supporting users of publicly provided support services The justification for these limitations are set out clearly in the supporting text and the relevant Topic Papers. In addition, policy J2 seeks to limit permitted change of use rights within Planning Use Class E by planning condition, primarily limiting to E(g)(i-iii) within employment areas. The Wigan EMELA (2024) recognises the potential impact of permitted development and Class E to the integrity of employment areas through facilitating the introduction of non-employment uses and the need to ensure that sufficient land is available for economic growth. This is consistent with the remaining criteria set out in Policy J2.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				

36.	Is it clear that any standards proposed for development are justified and deliverable, taking into account the scale of the development? [For example, onsite provision of open space, optional technical standards, internal and external space standards.]	Permitted development and Class E could lead to a range of non-employment land uses impacting on the integrity of the borough's Employment Areas, as well as reducing the supply of land available to support economic growth.				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Standards for development proposed in the Local Plan include in relation to: • Affordable housing (Policy H2): The 25% requirement is supported by the Local Housing Needs Assessment and the viability assessment. The inclusion of tenure requirements and accessibility standards is linked to identified housing needs. The policy includes viability safeguards, helping to demonstrate deliverability across different site types and market areas. • Accessible and adaptable housing (Policy H2): The plan requires M4(2) accessible and adaptable homes and 4% wheelchair accessible homes (M4(3)) on larger schemes. These standards are supported by evidence relating to an ageing population, disability needs and specialist accommodation requirements as set in the LHNA. • Employment and sustainability standards (Policy J3): The requirement for employment development to achieve EPC B or better, subject to viability and feasibility considerations, reflects climate change objectives and aligns with market trends in commercial development. • Parking and transport standards (Policy T2-T4): The plan includes parking standards, cycle parking requirements, Transport Assessment thresholds and				

		travel plan requirements which are all informed by transport evidence and consultation with key stakeholders including TfGM.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
	Deliverability					
37.	Has the viability of the local plan update been suitably tested and does this testing cover all requirements including in respect of any required standards, affordable housing provision and transport and other infrastructure needs and if relevant the implications of CIL?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: A robust and up-to-date viability assessment of the Local Plan has been undertaken by specialist consultants Aspinall Verdi. The viability testing has considered the cumulative impact of the Plan's requirements, including affordable housing, development standards, transport, and infrastructure contributions.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
38.	Does the local plan update reflect the conclusions and recommendations of your viability evidence? Is it clear the viability and delivery of development will not be put at risk by the requirements in the local plan update?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan largely reflects the conclusions of the Viability Assessment through the inclusion of viability flexibility mechanisms and a borough-wide affordable housing policy that accords with Aspinall Verdi's recommendations. The Viability Assessment tested the cumulative impact of policy requirements, including affordable housing, accessibility standards, biodiversity net gain, transport and other infrastructure contributions, and concludes that whilst viability is challenging in parts of the borough, particularly on brownfield sites in lower and				

		medium value areas, a borough-wide affordable housing target supported by site-specific viability provisions remains an appropriate approach. The evidence therefore identifies viability pressures rather than fundamental barriers to delivery. Whilst a number of typologies are shown to be unviable under current baseline assumptions, the Viability Assessment also highlights the potential influence of changing market conditions, grant funding, land value adjustments, regeneration interventions and the flexibility built into policy implementation. In considering whether these viability findings undermine the soundness of the Plan, regard should also be had to the July 2026 letter from Matthew Pennycook MP, the Minister of State for Housing and Planning, to the Planning Inspectorate on local plan examinations. The Minister advises that deliverability and viability issues should be considered in a broad context, particularly during periods of economic volatility, and that allocations should generally be assessed against their prospects for delivery over the plan period as a whole rather than solely against current market conditions. The letter further states that concerns regarding deliverability and viability should be approached pragmatically where there is a robust evidence base and a reasonable basis for concluding that allocations are capable of delivery over the life of the Plan. Inspectors are encouraged to distinguish between uncertainty arising from prevailing market conditions and evidence of a fundamental obstacle to delivery. Against that background, the Viability Assessment does not demonstrate a fundamental inability to deliver the Local Plan. Rather, it identifies market-sensitive viability challenges affecting some development typologies at the present time.
		Implications of taking no further action: None
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: None

39.	Does the monitoring framework clearly set out what matters will be monitored, and the indicators used? Are these measurable and can the data be readily secured/captured?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes, the monitoring framework, in chapter 13 of the plan, will assess the plan's performance against each of the eight strategic objectives, with each being monitored against a range of indicators, some specific and some contextual. Each indicator has a clear measurable target with an identified source for readily available data collection. Overall, it is considered that the monitoring framework is sufficiently clear, measurable and capable of identifying when policy intervention or review may be necessary.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
40.	Does the local plan update and monitoring framework identify a clear framework for <u>plan review</u> ?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan establishes a clear framework for monitoring and review. The Plan is supported by a monitoring framework containing indicators capable of assessing housing delivery, employment growth, infrastructure provision and environmental outcomes, thereby providing an evidence base for future review. In chapter 12, the Local Plan explicitly identifies the need for an early review to address longer-term housing and employment requirements and any consequential need for further strategic allocations or Green Belt release. These review mechanisms are justified by the current evidence, which demonstrates that identified housing and employment needs can presently be met				
	Where triggers for plan review and/or update are identified are they justified and proportionate?					

		without additional strategic land releases, whilst recognising that future evidence and changing circumstances, primarily the housing requirements set in the PfE Plan becoming out of date in March 2029, will likely require a different approach.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
	Plan effectiveness (and associated policy clarity)					
41.	Does the local plan update clearly set out the timeframe that it covers? Is it clear which policies are strategic? Will the strategic policies provide for a minimum of 15 years from adoption? Does the evidence relied on to support those policies correspond/cover this whole period?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: The Local Plan clearly identifies a plan period of 2022-2039 and clearly states which policies are strategic in Appendix 1. The evidence base, including housing, employment, sustainability appraisal and viability evidence, has been prepared to support the Plan over this period. As explained in chapter 12 of the Local Plan, the plan period to March 2039 aligns with that of the Places for Everyone Plan which forms part of the wider Development Plan for Wigan Borough. This will be 11 or 12 years from adoption of the Local Plan in 2027/28, below the normal requirement set in national planning policy for plans to “look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption”. Our case for this shorter plan period is set out clearly in chapter 12 of the Local Plan, which commits to an early plan review (in policy R1), at least in relation to meeting identified housing and employment needs, such as to prepare a plan to a suitably advanced stage by March 2029, to provide a plan-led position looking forward, at least, to 2045. As such, while the remaining period to 2039 may be less than 15 years from adoption, the combination of the existing strategic framework, the evidence base				

		and the proposed review mechanism provides an appropriate and effective approach to long-term planning.				
		Implications of taking no further action: As the plan period does not cover a plan period of 15 years from adoption, this will likely to be a principal matter for consideration at the examination.				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: None. We consider it premature to plan for housing needs beyond 2039 in this Local Plan prior to an assessment of housing needs being undertaken at the sub-regional level to establish what the housing figure should be for Wigan Borough from March 2029.				
42.	Does the local plan update clearly set out which <u>adopted</u> Development Plan policies it supersedes?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: This is clearly set out in Appendix 4.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
43.	Are the objectives the policies are trying to achieve clear, and can the policies be easily used and understood for decision making?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: We consider the objectives of the policies within the Local Plan are clear with a direct relationship between the issue being addressed, the policy requirements and the intended planning outcome. Our Development Management team have reviewed all the policies to ensure that, from their perspective, they can be clearly interpreted and be easily used and understood for decision making.				

		The policies use clear criteria-based wording and are supported by explanatory text which provides clear reasoning and justification that assists interpretation and implementation.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
44.	For each policy area you have designated or defined in the Plan: (i) are these clearly referenced and explained in the Plan; and (ii) clearly defined on the Policies Map? Where you have included maps or graphics within the local plan update are these legible and is it clear if and how they are to be used in decision making?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: i) Yes. The Local Plan clearly references all policy designations and explains them in the plan. This includes housing allocations (H3-H9), gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople sites (H12-H13), employment areas (J2), town centres (TC2-TC11), environmental designations, and heritage designations. The supporting text explains why the designation exists, its strategic purpose, the level of protection or development expected and how it relates to the wider spatial strategy. ii) All designations are clearly defined on the Policies Map, on which all boundaries are shown accurately, all layers are distinguishable, overlapping designations can be clearly identified, with map references which correspond exactly with policy references. The other graphics used in the Local Plan are: • Infographics in the spatial portrait showing key statistics for each of the seven key themes in the Local Plan. • The Key Diagram • Photographs				

		These are all legible and it is clear that these are illustrative, indicative and not to be used in decision making.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
45.	Does each local plan update policy: (i) make clear the type of development it will promote; (ii) use positive rather than negative wording?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: (i) Yes, where relevant, policies positively identify the forms of development that are sought or supported. Examples include: a. Housing allocation policies; b. Policy H2 which supports housing delivery whilst securing affordable and accessible housing provision; c. Employment policies which support economic growth, investment and the development of employment land; d. Town centre policies which direct retail, leisure and other main town centre uses towards the most appropriate centres within the hierarchy e. Environmental policies, which promote biodiversity enhancement, green infrastructure provision and climate resilience alongside development (ii) With exception, all policies use positive wording rather than negative wording, ensuring they are enabling rather than unduly restrictive. Policies relating to the following uses, however, do appropriately use more restrictive language as they seek to protect important assets, manage adverse impacts and/or prevent harmful development rather than preventing development in principle:				

		a. Hot food takeaways (PE2) b. Gambling and pay day loan establishments (PE3) c. children's residential and supported accommodation, mental health services, substance misuse treatment and adult social care (PE8) d. HMOs (H10) Overall, the Plan is consistent with national policy expectations that local plans should be prepared positively and provide a clear framework for decision-making. Implications of taking no further action: None Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
46.	Do policies make clear where they are intended to be applied differently for the purposes of decision-making dependent on (i) scale; (ii) use; or (iii) location of development proposed. [Note: If you have said 'all development' this implies equal application irrespective of the development scale/use/location and this may not be either justified or deliverable]	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes, the Local Plan generally makes clear where policy requirements vary according to the scale, use or location of development. A number of policies include specific thresholds that trigger additional requirements, particularly in relation to affordable housing, accessibility, health assessments and transport impacts. The Local Plan also differentiates clearly between different forms of development, including housing, employment, retail, leisure and specialist uses, and applies location-specific requirements through site allocations, employment areas, environmental designations and the centres hierarchy. As a result, decision-makers will be able to identify when a policy applies and what requirements are relevant to a particular proposal. Subject to the detailed wording of a small number of locally distinctive policies, the approach provides a clear and effective framework for decision-making.				

		Implications of taking no further action: None
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A
I	<i>State how many policies are in your local plan update?</i> <i>Can you list any policies within the local plan update that: (i) repeat parts of other policies within the plan; (ii) replicate or repeat paragraphs in the NPPF (iii) cross reference other policies.</i>	There are 66 policies proposed in the Local Plan. As set out in Appendix 1, this includes 20 strategic policies (of which 6 are site allocation policies). Following a review of the policies, it is considered that there are no policies which repeat other parts of policies in the plan or replicate or repeat paragraphs in the NPPF. Policies which include cross references to other policies are as follows (including the policies it cross references to in brackets): • PE2 (TC13) • PE5 (H3-H8, PE4) • PE6 (H1, PE5, H2) • H1 (PfE policy JP-H1) • H2 (PfE policy JP-H4) • H3 (H2, TC13, PfE policy JP-G8, EN7, PE6) • H4 (H2, TC13, PE4-6, PfE policy JP-G8, GM Joint Minerals Plan Policy 8) • H5 (H2, PfE policy JP-G8, PfE policy JP-P2, PL2, PE6) • H6 (H2, PfE policy JP-G8, PE6) • H7 (H2, PE6) • H8 (H2, EN4, PL6, PL2, EN7, PE6, PfE policy JP-G8) • H9 (Standish Neighbourhood Plan policy H1) • H11 (PE8) • J1 (J2, PfE policy JP-Strat8)

		• J3 (PfE policy JP-S2) • J4 (PL2, EN1, TC2-TC11) • J5 (PfE policy JP-C2, PfE policy JP-D1) • TC1 (TC2-TC12, PE2) • TC3 (J2) • TC4 (J2) • TC12 (TC1, PE2) • TC13 (H3, H4) • TC14 (EN7, TC1) • EN2 (EN1, EN3) • EN3 (EN1)				
47.	Based on the above, have you tried to avoid unnecessary repetition (of the NPPF, the PPG, or other policies within the local plan update) and cross referencing in policies? If you find duplication or repetition you may want to consider whether this is appropriate.	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes, all of the cross references are considered appropriate and add clarity and value by pointing the plan user to other relevant policies. They demonstrate consistency across the plan and reminder that the plan needs to be considered as a whole when preparing and determining planning applications.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				

48.	Do policies avoid duplicating other regulatory requirements (for example, building regulations)?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: Yes. Where regulatory requirements such as Building Regulations are referenced, it is to establish planning expectations and locally specific requirements rather than repeating the detailed provisions of these regulatory regimes. HMOs, hot food takeaways, gambling uses and specialist accommodation are subject to separate licensing health or social care controls, but the policies on these matters address land-use planning matters only.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
49.	Does the wording of plan policies avoid ambiguity? Are requirements clear to the decision-maker?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether plan meets this requirement	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, confident our plan meets this requirement
		Reason for score: It is considered that the wording of plan policies avoid ambiguity and have requirements that are clear to the decision maker.				
		Some policies, including those relating to HMOs, health and wellbeing, hot food takeaways, gambling uses and specialist accommodation, rely on concepts such as concentration, local need, community impact and health outcomes, but it is considered that these are clearly explained in the policy wording, supporting text, relevant Topic Papers and/or in relevant supplementary planning documents.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				