

5YHLS Methodology

	Summary of Council's position	Summary of Appellant's position
The base date as a “cut off” date	The Authority agrees that the base date for the 5 year supply relevant to this inquiry is the 30th September 2018. All the information contained within the Council's submitted proofs post the base date has been used merely to substantiate the assessments made, and in particular the delivery of the disputed sites. The information provided ensures that the Planning Inspector is aware of the facts in respect of completion figures and information from relevant developers and stakeholders. The Procedural Guide 'Planning Appeals – England' stipulates the necessity for Inspectors to be aware of any 'material changes in circumstances which have occurred' (para. 1.7) and will take into account, amongst other things 'any other matters that are material to the appeal' (para. 1.10.1). I consider it wholly reasonable and good practice to make the Inspector aware of all material considerations that are relevant to the case, just as the appellant has in making the Inspector aware of appeal decisions post the base date and updates on specific sites in the Proof of Evidence. None of the evidence provided includes any new sites, which are not already included within the HLAS.	The base date of 30th September 2018 is agreed (please refer to paragraph 2.6 of the Statement of Common Ground on Housing Land Supply). The HLAS was published in November 2018 The Council is seeking to rely on new evidence in the form of correspondence with developers and promoters and completion data that was not available at the time the HLAS was published. The Council should not publish the HLAS and then retrospectively seek to provide evidence to support its position in the weeks and months after it was published. Within this context, I refer to the Woolpit appeal decision (core document CD4.03 – paragraph 70), which found the approach the Council has applied to be “wholly inadequate”. Further, I note that the Council seeks to use the new evidence to “validate” its position, but this has in fact led to the removal of the site at Worthalls Farm, Read (site 06 – 15 dwellings) from the supply and a reduction in the Council's claimed deliverable supply at land to the south west of Barrow (site 03 – by 10 dwellings) and land at Waddington Road (site 04, by 50 dwellings). The problem with the Council's approach is that it is only seeking to update the position on the disputed sites and not the other uncontested sites which are in the supply. The position on those sites may also have changed as it appears to have on the three (of the 6) disputed sites where the Council now reduces the supply. The assessment should be based on the evidence available at the time the HLAS was published.
Build rates and lead-in times	The Authority has based all assessments of delivery upon verbal discussions, e-mails and evidence from developers in the form of signed Statements of Common Ground (SOCG) and resultant completions on site to substantiate the assumptions made. For the Authority to make any assumptions of average build rates and lead-in times on the basis of reviewing all previously developed sites is crude. The rate of delivery and the lead-in time of each site is very much site specific. Sites approved for development within the Borough differ significantly in size, number of dwellings proposed, site constraints and developer for example; they cannot be compared like-for-like, hence why the Authority relies on clear evidence of delivery from various stakeholders.	The PPG (paragraphs 3-036, 3-047 and 3-048) places great weight on the adequacy and sufficiency of consultation with developers. Paragraph 3-047 of the PPG states: <i>“Local planning authorities may need to develop a range of assumptions and benchmarks to help to inform and test assessments. Assumptions can include lapse/non-implementation rates in permissions, lead-in times and build rates, and these assumptions and yardsticks can be used to test delivery information or can be used where there is no information available from site owners/developers to inform the assessment. Assumptions should be based on clear evidence, consulted upon with stakeholders, including developers, and regularly reviewed and tested against actual performance on comparable sites. Tables of assumptions should be clear and transparent and available as part of assessments.”</i> The Council has not done this. It has accepted the information it has received from those promoting sites on face value and not tested these against actual performance on comparable sites. The problem with the Council's approach is that it leads to unrealistic build rates and lead in times, which in turn lead to a poor record of over-predicting housing delivery. This is evidenced by charts 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 of my proof of evidence (pages 12-15), which show actual completions in the Ribble Valley against the estimated completions. In each case, the actual dwellings completed have been substantially below those the Council has estimated would be completed.

	Summary of Council's position	Summary of Appellant's position
Draft allocations	The proposed allocations within the HED DPD have been subject to examination in public and the appropriate consultations. The Planning Inspectors report on the DPD is expected imminently. Given the stage of preparation of this emerging plan the Council considers it is afforded moderate weight in terms of decision making. The proposed allocations however are not included within the Council's 5 year housing land supply as it is not considered that these sites meet the Framework's definition of deliverable.	The supply set out in the HLAS does not include any of the proposed allocations in the HED DPD in the deliverable supply. These sites do not meet the definition of "deliverable" as they were not allocations at the base date (please refer to paragraph 33 of the Entech House decision – core document CD4.04). The sites are subject to objection and therefore it is not known whether they will be allocated in the final version of the HED DPD. Even if they were allocations, the Council has not provided the "clear evidence" required for these sites to be considered deliverable in accordance with the definition of "deliverable" set out in the NPPF.

Disputed sites

	Summary of Council’s position						Summary of Appellant’s position																																									
	RVBC Expected Rate Of Delivery (Phase 1 &2)																																															
Site 01: Higher Standen (Difference = 158 dwellings)	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total																																				
	50	50	68	85	55	308	30	30	30	30	30	150																																				
	The site has outline planning permission for up to 1,040 homes. Phase 1 has detailed consent for 228 dwellings and the development commenced on the 13th September 2017 with the first dwelling completed on the 8th June 2018. At the point of publishing the most recent ‘5 Year Supply Statement’ with a base date of 30th September there had been 20 completions on the site and 82 under construction (refer to page 26 of the ‘5 Year Supply, HLAS found at Appendix 1 of my proof of evidence) . As of the 31st March 2019 45 dwellings have been completed on the site since works commenced in September 2017. A signed Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) with Taylor Wimpey, dated 15th November 2018, clarifies the expected delivery of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the development. With regards to Phase 1, Taylor Wimpey outlined within the SOCG a rate of delivery for each year as follows (Appendix 7 of my proof of evidence): <table><tr><th colspan="6">Phase 1 (Permission granted for 228)</th></tr><tr><td>Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19</td><td>Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20</td><td>Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21</td><td>Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22</td><td>Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td>50</td><td>50</td><td>48</td><td>45</td><td>13</td><td>206</td></tr></table> With regards to Phase 2, Taylor Wimpey outlined within the SOCG a rate of delivery for each year as follows (Appendix 7 of my proof of evidence): <table><tr><th colspan="6">Phase 2</th></tr><tr><td>Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19</td><td>Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20</td><td>Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21</td><td>Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22</td><td>Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>20</td><td>40</td><td>40</td><td>100</td></tr></table> The cumulative total for both phases above amounts to 306 dwellings. At the time of signing the SOCG (Nov 18) Taylor Wimpey considered that 22 completions had occurred on Phase 1, hence the cumulative total of 206 dwellings that they outlined within the signed SOCG for Phase 1 (228 as permitted – 22). The cumulative total for both phases of 308 dwellings was put into the 5 year supply at the base date (30/9/18), as opposed to 306 as outlined by Taylor Wimpey, as at that						Phase 1 (Permission granted for 228)						Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total	50	50	48	45	13	206	Phase 2						Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total	0	0	20	40	40	100	Please refer to chapter 13 of my proof of evidence (pages 44-48) It is agreed that this site should be considered “deliverable”. However, the number of dwellings that should be considered deliverable within the five year period is disputed. Phase 1 of the site has detailed consent for 228 no. dwellings and is under construction. At the time the HLAS was prepared, the remaining phases only had outline planning permission. Applications for reserved matters on the later phases do not need to be made until 17th April 2022. There is only evidence of one developer on the site (Taylor Wimpey). The Council has a poor record of predicting housing delivery at the Standen site. The housing trajectory in the Core Strategy (pages 178 and 179) assumed that the site would deliver 100 dwellings per annum from 2014/15. Each HLAS has then included between 165 and 300 dwellings as being deliverable on this site in the five year period (table 13.1, page 45 of my proof of evidence). In the first year of delivery (1st October 2017 to 30th September 2018) 20 dwellings were completed on the site. The Council has applied over-optimistic build rates without considering the build rate experienced on other comparable sites as paragraph 3-047 of the PPG: “How can authorities review their 5 year land supply annually?” explains should be done. I have considered the build rates experienced on Taylor Wimpey’s other site in Ribble Valley (“Tootle Green” in Longridge) and note that an average build rate of 29 dwellings per annum is being experienced at that site (table 13.3, page 47 of my proof of evidence). I have also considered the build rates experienced on other large sites in Clitheroe and note that the average build rate experienced is between 27 and 30 dwellings per annum (tables 13.4, 13.5 and 13.6, pages 47 to 49 of my proof of evidence). Consequently, the evidence demonstrates that the average build rate on large sites in Clitheroe is just below 30 dwellings per annum. This is similar to the build rate experienced on Taylor Wimpey’s other site, which is under construction in Longridge. On this basis, there is no justification for increasing the build rate at Higher Standen to between 50 and 85 dwellings. The build rate of 30 dwellings per annum should be applied and this means that 150 dwellings should be considered deliverable in the five year period and 158 dwellings should be removed from the Council’s supply set out in the HLAS.					
Phase 1 (Permission granted for 228)																																																
Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total																																											
50	50	48	45	13	206																																											
Phase 2																																																
Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total																																											
0	0	20	40	40	100																																											

	time the Authority was in receipt of the latest NHBC figures which confirmed that 20 completions had been completed on the site. It should be noted that the NHBC figures and completion certificates that the Council are in receipt of are generally a month behind actual completions on the ground. Therefore , whilst it may have been the case that at the point of compiling the HLAS (Nov 2018) 22 completions had in fact occurred, the Authority was only in receipt of completion certificates for 20 dwellings and took the considered approach that this form of verification should be relied upon to outline the projected delivery on site. To validate our base-date assumptions the Authority has sought to monitor completions on the site. Taylor Wimpey stated that they expect 50 completions on site by September of this year. 45 dwellings have been completed on the site as of the 31st March 2019. On this basis, to complete a further 5 dwellings by September this year and 50 per annum thereafter as per the signed SOCG is considered realistic and achievable. An e-mail was received on the 27th March 2019 from the Land and Planning Manager at Taylor Wimpey to confirm that the housing delivery figures within the agreed statement of common ground (dated November 2018) remain accurate (refer to Appendix 9 of my proof of evidence). Taylor Wimpey's Senior Land and Planning Manager has confirmed (Document 5 - e-mail dated 30th April 2019 as submitted at the Inquiry) that they intend to continue the build from phase one directly into phase two and a reserved matters planning application covering both phases two and three will be submitted imminently. Taylor Wimpey's business plan forecasts 50 private sale housing completions from this site in 2019 and 50 private sale housing completions in 2020. They will build the 30% affordable housing provision which is spread across the site and expect roughly 30% of the private sale deliveries in each year to be delivered as affordable. As such Taylor Wimpey's business plan for this site includes 50 private sale units per year and a further 15 affordable housing units per year totalling 65 dwellings to be delivered from the site in any twelve month period. The figures combined for years 3-5 (68 + 85 + 53) average as 69 dwellings per year. Whilst slightly higher than the 65 dwellings per year included within the developer's business plan the Senior Land and Planning Manager does not consider that this is an unreasonable delivery target. The Council considers that the rate of delivery and the lead-in time of each site is very much site specific and cannot be compared like-for like. The numbers included within the HLAS is based upon clear evidence of delivery on this site and supported by information from the housing developer for this site.	
--	--	--

	Summary of Council's position						Summary of Appellant's position					
	RVBC Expected Rate Of Delivery (Phase 1, 2 &3)											
Site 02: Chipping Lane, Longridge	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total
(Difference = 106 dwellings)	20	54	68	68	36	246	20	30	30	30	30	140
	The site has outline planning permission for up to 363 dwellings. Phase 1 has detailed consent for 118 dwellings and Phases 2&3 have detailed consent for 193 dwellings (dated 12th April 2019) Barratt Homes are the housing developer for this site with the first dwelling on Phase 1 completed on the 15th November 2018. The delivery rate included within the Councils HLAS is based upon a signed Statement of Common Ground (SOCG), 15th November 2018, with Barratt Homes. On the basis of the agreed SOCG, 124 dwellings for Phase 1 of the development have been included in the 5 year supply and 122 dwellings have been included within the 5 year supply for Phases 2 and 3. As of the 31st March 2019 21 dwellings have been completed on Phase 1 which exceeds the figure included within year 1 of the Council's 5 year housing land supply. The Council considers that the rate of delivery and the lead-in time of each site is very much site specific and cannot be compared like-for like. The numbers included within the HLAS is based upon clear evidence of delivery on this site and supported by information from the housing developer for this site.						Please refer to chapter 13 of my proof of evidence (pages 49-51) It is agreed that this site should be considered “deliverable”. However, the number of dwellings that should be considered deliverable within the five year period is disputed. Phase 1 of the site has detailed consent for 118 no. dwellings and is under construction. After the base date but just before the HLAS was published (i.e. in October 2018), an application for reserved matters on phases 2 and 3 was made for 184 dwellings. This is not surprising because all applications for reserved matters had to be made by 29th October 2018. There is only evidence of one developer on the site (Barratt Homes). In each of the previous HLAS statements, the Council has claimed that between 120 and 150 dwellings should be considered deliverable at this site in the five year period (table 13.6, page 50 of my proof of evidence). The Council now claims that 246 dwellings should be considered deliverable in the five year period. The Council has applied over-optimistic build rates without considering the build rate experienced on other comparable sites as paragraph 3-047 of the PPG: “How can authorities review their 5 year land supply annually?” explains should be done. As above, the other site which is currently being built in Longridge and has made completions over the past two years is Taylor Wimpey's site known as “Tootle Green”. The average build rate at that site is 29 dwellings per annum (table 13.3, page 47 of my proof of evidence). The build rate of 30 dwellings per annum should be applied and this means that 150 dwellings should be considered deliverable in the five year period and 106 dwellings should be removed from the Council's supply set out in the HLAS.					

	Summary of Council’s position						Summary of Appellant’s position																
	RVBC Expected Rate Of Delivery – As per the base date (30 th Sept 18)																						
Site 03: Land to the south-west of Barrow and west of Whalley Road, Barrow (Difference = 50 dwellings)	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total											
	0	30	50	50	50	180	0	0	30	50	50	130											
	The site has outline planning permission for up to 504 dwellings. Phase 1 (183 dwellings - Parcel A) is currently under construction by Redrow Homes and as of 31st March 2019 15 dwellings have been completed on the site. Phase 2 (Parcel B) have detailed consent for 225 dwellings. On the 16th January 2019 a full application for 233 dwellings on Phase 2 (Parcel B) was submitted by David Wilson Homes in partnership with Taylor Wimpey. The application is due to be considered at the Planning and Development Committee meeting on the 24th May 2019. On the basis of the e-mail received from DWH and Taylor Wimpey (refer to Appendix 12 of my proof of evidence), 180 dwellings for Phase 2 of the site have been included in the 5 year supply. The access road to the site has been constructed and there are no planning conditions on the original outline consent which would result in delay to the site commencing works. With regards to expected delivery on the site, David Wilson Homes has achieved the delivery of approximately 50 dwellings per year at their site at Mitton Road, Whalley (Appn. No. 3/2012/0637) known as ‘Monks Cross’, which commenced 21st June 2016, and remains under construction. Furthermore, Taylor Wimpey developed the site directly north-east of the Appeal site (also off Henthorn Road) with Barratt Homes for 270 dwellings which commenced on 4th September 2013 and completed 2nd February 2018. An e-mail from the Planning Director at David Wilson Homes on 10th April (Document 5 as submitted at the Inquiry) confirms that should consent be granted in July (following Committee in May when the Section 106 Agreement will be completed), they would look to acquire the site towards the end of September. The Planning Director has confirmed the following: - First completions could take place in June/July 2020. I would now suggest that 20 units could be occupied up to 30th Sept 2020, not 30. - The previously suggested figures remain accurate for 2021 and beyond (with the extra 10 units extending up to December 2023), and represent the total number of dwellings from the joint site. In acknowledgement of the most recent e-mail (dated 10th April) as outlined above expected delivery on the site has been amended from that which was submitted as part of the most recent HLAS (Sept 18) as follows: <table><tr><td>Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19</td><td>Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20</td><td>Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21</td><td>Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22</td><td>Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>20</td><td>50</td><td>50</td><td>50</td><td>170</td></tr></table>						Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total	0	20	50	50	50	170	Please refer to chapter 14 of my proof of evidence (pages 52-55) It is agreed that this site should be considered “deliverable”. However, the number of dwellings that should be considered deliverable within the five year period is disputed. At the base date the site had detailed consent, but it was clear that that permission would not be implemented because the application for reserved matters had been made by the land owner (Barrow Lands Company Ltd). This remained the case at the time the HLAS was published, although I note that since then a full application had been made by Taylor Wimpey and David Wilson. The evidence available at the time the HLAS was published was that - Taylor Wimpey and Barratt David Wilson Homes intended to make a full planning application; and - Neither developer would sign a statement of common ground with the Council because neither housebuilder owned the site and needed to sign a contract with the landowner. In terms of build rates, because there are two developers, 50 dwellings per annum is not unrealistic. Although this will be subject taking into account that there would effectively be three house builders (Redrow, Taylor Wimpey and David Wilson Homes) all effectively building at the same site. However, in terms of lead-in times, the Council should have allowed time for a full planning application to be prepared, submitted and determined, a S106 agreement negotiated and signed, the contractual arrangements between the landowner and the developers made and applied the average lead-in time from whenever the decision could be issued to the time when dwellings would be delivered. I have reviewed 11 large sites (of 40 dwellings or more), which were recorded as being under construction at the base date and I note that it takes on average 16.25 months from the approval of reserved matters / full planning permission on a large site until the first dwelling is recorded as being delivered (please refer to appendix EP7 of my proof of evidence). This is not surprising because before a dwelling is delivered on a large site, then pre-commencement conditions need to be discharged, access needs to be put in place along with infrastructure such as internal access roads and utilities. Show homes and / or a marketing area is then usually put in place before the completion of any dwellings. Therefore allowing time for a full application to be submitted, considered and approved and a S106 agreement agreed and then applying the average lead-in time of 16.25 months, this means that completions at this site could be expected in year 3, not year 2 as the Council assumes and means that 50 dwellings should be removed from the Council’s supply set out in the HLAS.				
Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total																		
0	20	50	50	50	170																		

	On 1st May 2019 the Associate Land and Planning Director at Taylor Wimpey confirmed via e-mail agreement with the build rates (copy of which submitted to the appellant and at the Inquiry) along with confirmation that progress is being made with the Section 106 Agreement.	
--	--	--

	Summary of Council’s position						Summary of Appellant’s position																		
	RVBC Expected Rate Of Delivery – As per the base date (30 th Sept 18)																								
Site 04: Land off Waddington Road, Clitheroe (Difference = 50 dwellings)	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total													
	0	30	50	50	50	180	0	0	30	50	50	130													
	The site has detailed consent for 208 dwellings (dated 7 th February 2019). Clear evidence, by way of a signed Statement of Common Ground on the 15th November 2018 (refer to Appendix 15 of my proof of evidence) to clarify the expected delivery of the site was e-mailed to the Authority and as such 180 dwellings were included in the HLAS with a 30 th September 2018 base date. Since the base date (30th September 2018) a number of discharge of condition applications have been submitted along with a Section 73 application to vary 2 of the conditions attached to the outline planning permission. • Application Number 3/2019/0081 – Discharge of Conditions application • Application Number 3/2019/0179 – Discharge of Conditions application • Application Number 3/2019/0056 – Variation of conditions 27 and 28 of outline planning permission 3/2014/0597 (up to 275 new dwellings and access) to allow 49 houses to be occupied on the site before all S278 works (highway adoption/improvements) have to be completed. At the point of assessing the 5 year supply at the base date the signed SOCG from the developer was considered to be clear evidence of the expected rate of delivery on the site. Since such time the Council is aware that a number of conditions need to be discharged. On this basis, the Authority is of the opinion that a more conservative rate of delivery should be applied to this site and proposes to reduce the 5 year housing land supply for this site by 50 dwellings as per the following table: <table><tr><th>Phase 1 Years 1-5</th><th>Number of Dwellings which will be completed</th></tr><tr><td>1st October 2018 – 30th September 2019</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>1st October 2019 – 30th September 2020</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>1st October 2020 – 30th September 2021</td><td>30</td></tr><tr><td>1st October 2021 – 30th September 2022</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>1st October 2022 – 30th September 2023</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>Beyond September 2023</td><td>77</td></tr></table> As the site will be managed by joint developers 50 per annum from October 2021 is not considered to be unrealistic. This reflects the appellant’s assumptions for this site.						Phase 1 Years 1-5	Number of Dwellings which will be completed	1st October 2018 – 30th September 2019	0	1st October 2019 – 30th September 2020	0	1st October 2020 – 30th September 2021	30	1st October 2021 – 30th September 2022	50	1st October 2022 – 30th September 2023	50	Beyond September 2023	77	Please refer to chapter 14 of my proof of evidence (pages 55-56) It is agreed that this site should be considered “deliverable”. However, the number of dwellings that should be considered deliverable within the five year period is disputed. At the base date the site had outline planning permission, but a reserved matters application had been made by Barratt and David Wilson Homes and was pending determination. This remained the case at the time the HLAS was published. In terms of build rates, because there are two developers, 50 dwellings per annum is not unrealistic. However, in terms of lead-in times, the Council should have allowed time for the reserved matters application to be determined, the pre-commencement conditions to be discharged, access put in place along with infrastructure such as internal access roads and utilities. As above, I have reviewed 11 large sites (of 40 dwellings or more), which were recorded as being under construction at the base date and I note that it takes on average 16.25 months from the approval of reserved matters / full planning permission on a large site until the first dwelling is recorded as being delivered (please refer to appendix EP7 of my proof of evidence). Therefore applying the average lead-in time means that completions at this site could be expected in year 3, not year 2 as the Council assumes and means that 50 dwellings should be removed from the Council’s supply set out in the HLAS.				
Phase 1 Years 1-5	Number of Dwellings which will be completed																								
1st October 2018 – 30th September 2019	0																								
1st October 2019 – 30th September 2020	0																								
1st October 2020 – 30th September 2021	30																								
1st October 2021 – 30th September 2022	50																								
1st October 2022 – 30th September 2023	50																								
Beyond September 2023	77																								

	Summary of Council’s position						Summary of Appellant’s position																
	RVBC Expected Rate Of Delivery – As per the base date (30 th Sept 18)																						
Site 05: Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe (Difference = 24 dwellings)	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total	Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total											
	0	12	12	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0											
	The site has outline planning permission for up to 24 dwellings. The applicants, The Strategic Land Group Limited, signed a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) on the 9th November 2018 to clarify the expected delivery of the site. The site met the ‘definition of deliverable’ as per paragraph 73 (b) of the Framework at the point it was included in the latest Housing Land Supply. The signed SOCG by the promoter of the site constitutes clear evidence of the intentions to promote and deliver the site within the next 5 years. To further substantiate this assertion the Managing Director of The Strategic Land Group confirmed, on the 26th March 2019, has 2 parties interested in the site. Active marketing of the site is imminent. The site has consent for only 24 dwellings, and based upon evidence to date, it is not unrealistic to expect all 24 dwellings to be completed by 30 th September 2023. Upon reflection the expected rate of delivery has been amended as follows: <table><tr><td>Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19</td><td>Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20</td><td>Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21</td><td>Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22</td><td>Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>12</td><td>12</td><td>24</td></tr></table>						Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total	0	0	0	12	12	24	I do not consider that this site meets the revised definition of what constitutes a “deliverable” site as set out in the 2019 NPPF. At the base date, the site had outline planning permission. An application for reserved matters had not been made. This was also the case when the HLAS was published. In accordance with the outline planning permission, an application for reserved matters does not need to be made until 6 th June 2021 and then the development must begin 2 years after the reserved matters application has been approved. Therefore, development may not commence on the site within the five year period, which ends on 30 th September 2023. The onus is on the Council to provide “clear evidence” for the site to be considered “deliverable”. The 2019 NPPF does not set out further details of the type of “clear evidence” required. However, paragraph 3-036 of the PPG lists two examples: a statement of common ground between the Council and the “site developer, which confirms the developers’ delivery intentions and an anticipated start and build-out rate” and / or a planning performance agreement that sets out the timescale for conclusion of reserved matters applications and discharge of conditions. Neither of the two documents referred to as examples in the PPG have been provided by the Council. Instead, the Council has provided a statement of common ground between the Council and the site promoter (SLG), but this just explains that the site is reliant on the road through the Story Homes site to the north, marketing of the site commenced in 2018 and there is developer interest. It states that contracts with a developer are not expected to be exchanged until summer 2019 and after that a reserved matters application will be submitted. Consequently, there is no named developer for this site who can commit to the trajectory for this site set out in the Council’s HLAS. The Council has not provided the “clear evidence” required for this site to be considered deliverable and therefore the site should not be included in the supply.				
Year 1 01/10/18 – 30/09/19	Year 2 01/10/19 – 30/09/20	Year 3 01/10/20 – 30/09/21	Year 4 01/10/21 – 30/09/22	Year 5 01/10/22 – 30/09/23	Total																		
0	0	0	12	12	24																		

	Summary of Council's position	Summary of Appellant's position																														
Small sites and windfall allowance	The Council's windfall allowance is based upon past trends. The current HLAS includes a very conservative contribution of windfall housing sites within the supply excluding a number of developments, including barn conversions and developments outside of the main settlements. This conservative approach was partly based upon the original definition of windfall sites contained within the Framework and to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply without over-reliance on windfall sites. To assist the Inspector the Council's rebuttal included a table (Table 1, Page 10) detailing the number of dwellings completed on small sites. For the purposes of collating the HLAS small sites constitute as those less than 0.4 hectares. This data concludes that an average of 70 dwellings per year are delivered on small sites, which includes windfall sites, and as such the inclusion of 378 dwellings (300 dwellings which already have planning permission on small sites and an additional 78 windfall developments in years 3-5), an average of 75 per year within the five year housing land supply, is not considered to be unrealistic and is achievable based upon past trends. This raw data used to populate this table was provided to the appellants housing witness on 30th April 2019. It has been identified that a number of the completed dwellings included within the Table 1 (Page 10) of the Council's rebuttal were actually Included as a large site in the HLAS. This is notwithstanding the number of dwellings approved but due to the fact that the site exceeds 0.4 hectares and were included in error due to how the raw data is recorded. To rectify this error the table has been corrected as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Total dwellings</th><th>Small site dwellings</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2013/14</td><td>183</td><td>58</td></tr> <tr> <td>2014/15</td><td>345</td><td>62</td></tr> <tr> <td>2015/16</td><td>300</td><td>60</td></tr> <tr> <td>2016/17</td><td>390</td><td>63</td></tr> <tr> <td>2017/18</td><td>400</td><td>54</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Total (2013 - 2018)</td><td>1618</td><td>297</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Total dwellings	Small site dwellings				2013/14	183	58	2014/15	345	62	2015/16	300	60	2016/17	390	63	2017/18	400	54				Total (2013 - 2018)	1618	297				In each HLAS in Ribble Valley, small sites are defined as sites which are under 0.4 ha in area or have a capacity of less than 10 dwellings. The Council's HLAS includes 300 dwellings on small sites plus a windfall allowance of 78 dwellings. Therefore, the HLAS considers that 378 dwellings should be considered deliverable in the five year period. This equates to an average of 76 dwellings per annum. It is important to look at past trends when considering how many dwellings on small sites should be considered deliverable in the five year period. The table on page 5 of the HLAS (CD5.02) states that the average number of dwellings completed or under construction on windfall sites between 2008 and 2018 was 26. However, because this includes dwellings under construction, it is not clear from this table how many dwellings had been completed. Table 1 on page 10 of Ms Horton's rebuttal evidence then indicated that 350 dwellings had been completed on small sites (including windfall sites) between 1st April 2013 and 31st March 2018 (an average of 70 dwellings per annum). On 27/04/19 I asked for the data behind Table 1 of Ms Horton's rebuttal evidence and on 30/04/19 was provided with a list of completions. However, the completion data included some large sites (i.e. sites which are more than 0.4 ha in area or had permission for 10 or more dwellings). I concluded that 71 dwellings had been incorrectly listed as small sites and therefore completions on small sites over the period 1st April 2013 and 31st March 2018 had been 279 dwellings (an average of 56 dwellings per annum). The Council agrees that the 350 dwelling figure in Table 1 of Ms Horton's rebuttal is incorrect and considers that 297 dwellings had been completed on small sites (an average of 59 dwellings per annum). At the round table session, the Council concluded that 297 dwellings should be used as its figure for small sites with planning permission and small windfall sites and not 378 as referred to above. This would mean a reduction in its supply of 81 dwellings (i.e. 378 – 297). However, my view is that 279 dwellings were completed on small sites over the period 1st April 2013 to 31st March 2018, not 297. The reason why there is a difference of 18 dwellings is because the Council relies on the fact that the HLAS documents include these as small sites. However on two of the sites (Black Hill in Sabden – 8 dwellings and Higher Road, Longridge – 3 dwellings), the application documents confirm that the site area is over 0.4 ha and the third site (Kirklands, Chipping – 7 dwellings) had planning permission for over 10 dwellings (11 in total). In addition, when considering whether to project the past trend forward over the next five years, it is important to note that more small sites had planning permission at 1st April 2013 (327 in total – please see paragraph 16.15, pages 62 and 63 of my proof of evidence) than they did at the base date of the current HLAS on 30th September 2018 (i.e. 300). This indicates that the expected future trend of completions on small sites would be less than 56 dwellings per annum. 279 completions against the 327 dwellings that had planning permission on small sites = 85% and therefore applying this to the 300 dwellings which currently have planning permission means that 256 dwellings could be expected on small sites in the current five year period (an average of 51 dwellings per annum). This means that my supply figure should be increased by 126 dwellings and this has been reflected in the summary table of positions.
Year	Total dwellings	Small site dwellings																														
2013/14	183	58																														
2014/15	345	62																														
2015/16	300	60																														
2016/17	390	63																														
2017/18	400	54																														
Total (2013 - 2018)	1618	297																														

Average per year (2013 - 2018)	324	59
01/04/18 - 30/06/18	107	26
01/07/2018 - 30/09/18	85	9
Total (01/04/18 - 30/09/18)	192	35
Combined Total	1810	94

The following three sites are included within the above completed figure but disputed by the appellants. The reason the sites have been included as a small site by the Council is as follows:

2013-14

Monitoring year	Application ref:	Address	No. of dwellings completed	Reason for inclusion	HLAS Ref
2013-14	3/2010/0113	1-8 Black Hill View Sabden	8	The site area is under 0.4 hectares	April 2012- page 17

2015-16

Monitoring year	Application ref:	Address	No. of dwellings completed	Reason for inclusion	HLAS Ref
2015-16	3/2009/0399	Flats 1-7, 33 Kirklands Chipping	7	Notwithstanding the number of dwellings the site area is less than 0.4 hectares	2010- page 2 and 12

	2016-17						
	Monitoring year	Application ref:	Address	No. of dwellings completed	Reason for inclusion	HLAS Ref	
	2016-17	3/2014/0482	1,2,3 Highfield Close Longridge	3	Site area is under 0.4 hectares	Jan 2015- page 59	
	A copy of the respective parts of each relevant HLAS are attached for reference. The Council considers that the delivery of 59 dwellings per year (297 / 5), over the 5 year period on small sites and windfall sites is a realistic and achievable number as this represents the average number of dwellings which have actually been delivered on such sites within the last 5 years. The Council's housing land supply figure has been updated accordingly.						

	Summary of Council's position	Summary of Appellant's position
Affordable housing	The Plan period runs until 2028 and there is a requirement for sites to include a percentage of affordable housing on site. The Council considers that the affordable housing target, 75 units a year in accordance with the Adopted Core Strategy, is achievable during the plan period. Whilst the provision of approximately 33 affordable houses on this site will marginally assist in meeting the Borough's affordable housing need the unsustainable nature of the site does not make it a suitable location for affordable housing provision.	Please refer to chapter 20 (pages 67-68) of my proof of evidence. There is a pressing need for affordable housing in Ribble Valley. The 2013 SHMA concluded that there was an annual net need of 404 affordable dwellings. The Core Strategy Inspector took into account a recalculation based on a higher percentage (35%) of income spent on housing than the SHMA did (25%). This reduces the net annual need to 268 affordable homes. The Core Strategy Inspector also took into account 154 households living in private rented accommodation but still found the scale of need to be 114 dwellings per annum. Notwithstanding this, the Core Strategy only monitors affordable housing against a housing target of 75 dwellings per annum (i.e. a target of 1,500 homes over the plan period 2008-28). The HLAS confirms that just 647 dwellings have been delivered between 1st April 2008 and 30th September 2018, which even against the target of 75 affordable dwellings per annum leads to a shortfall of 141 affordable homes. I have reviewed the commitments and on the Council's own figures, the target of 1,500 affordable homes (which is well below the actual level of need) will not be met (please refer to appendix EP8 of my proof of evidence). This assumes that the Standen and Chipping Lane sites will achieve the over-optimistic build rates applied by the Council. Once realistic build rates are applied to those sites then the affordable housing target will not be met by an even greater margin.

	Summary of Council's position	Summary of Appellant's position
Clitheroe's housing land supply	The Council acknowledge that the Standen site is now unlikely to deliver the housing numbers incorporated into the Adopted Core Strategy within the plan period. The figure included was based on relevant and up to date evidence at the time of adoption. The Core Strategy will be 5 years old this year. In accordance with guidance contained within the Framework the Core Strategy will be reviewed this year to ensure that the changing circumstances affecting the area, including housing delivery within the Borough and local housing need, are reflected within the local planning policies. The review will identify any housing requirements within the Borough and identify suitable sustainable sites to address any housing requirements identified.	It is agreed that the total minimum number of dwellings required for Clitheroe over the plan period from 1st April 2008 to 31st March 2028 is 2,320 dwellings as set out in the table at paragraph 4.12 on page 42 of the Core Strategy. This includes 1,040 dwellings at the Standen Strategic Site. Page 8 of the Housing Position Paper (CD5.04) confirms that there were 812 dwellings completed in Clitheroe between 1st April 2008 and 2028 and there is planning permission for a further 1,700 dwellings on sites in Clitheroe (including 1,040 dwellings at the Standen Strategic Site). It states that there is no residual requirement for Clitheroe. Indeed, it claims that there is an oversupply of 221 dwellings. However, the Standen Strategic Site will not deliver in full in the plan period to 2028. There is only one developer on the site. The Council's own evidence, which it presented to the HED DPD Inspector is that the Standen Strategic Site will deliver 508 dwellings in the plan period, with the remaining 532 dwellings delivered after 2028. This is set out in table 2 of the Housing Position Paper (CD5.04 on pages 14 and 15). Therefore, rather than there being an over-supply of housing in Clitheroe, even on the Council's figures there is a residual requirement of 311 dwellings (i.e. 532 dwellings which will not be delivered at Standen minus the 221 dwelling "oversupply" in the HPP). This residual requirement will not be met by the proposed allocations in the HED DPD, which even if they are found sound would mean that only around 160 dwellings are allocated on additional sites in Clitheroe on sites MM1, MM2 and MM3). The 311 dwelling figure assumes that 488 dwellings will be delivered on the Standen Strategic Site between 1st October 2008 and 31st March 2028 (i.e. an average of 51 dwellings per annum). Applying the build rate experienced on other sites in Clitheroe of 30 dwellings per annum means that 285 dwellings would be delivered on that site in the plan period and the residual requirement for Clitheroe is even greater. I conclude that the residual requirement is 514 dwellings.