

Area of Dispute	Appellants Comments	LPA Comments	Inspectors Notes
PLANNING			
Accordance with the development plan	The proposal accords with the Development Plan in particular Key Statements DS2 and DMI2, as well as policies DMG2 and DMG3.	The Council considers that the proposed development would result in an unsustainable form of development contrary to Key Statements DS2 and DMI2, as well as Policies DMG2 and DMG3, of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.	
Whether the presumption in paragraph 11 (c) NPPF is engaged	The presumption in paragraph 11(c) NPPF is engaged by virtue of the Scheme's compliance with the Development Plan.	The Council considers that paragraph 11(c) is not engaged as the development proposals do not accord with the Authorities up-to-date development plan	
Whether the tilted balance test of paragraph 11 (d) of the Framework is engaged	The Council are unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and therefore the policies most important to the determination of this appeal are out of date and the tilted planning balance is engaged through paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF.	The Council considers that the tilted balance test in paragraph 11(d) is not engaged as the Council can demonstrated a 5 year housing land supply	
Whether the sites location in the open countryside accords with the development plan	Policy DMG2 supports development, such as the appeal scheme, outside of settlement boundaries in areas of open countryside.	The Council does not consider that the development plan policies support the development of this countryside site due to its unsustainable location	
The weight to be afforded to the provision of affordable housing on the site	There has been a significant shortfall in the delivery of affordable housing over the plan period when measured against the SHMA requirement, the Inspector's reduced requirement or the AMR target of 75 dwellings per annum. The delivery of the 30% affordable housing onsite is therefore a significant benefit.	The Council agrees that the provision of approximately 33 affordable houses on this site will marginally assist in meeting the Borough's affordable housing need. However the unsustainable nature of the site does not make it a suitable location for affordable housing provision.	
ACCESSIBILITY			
Locational Sustainability	The site is considered by the Council not to be in a sustainable location. There is a	The Council considers that as the local shops, services and community facilities are	

	range of shops, services and community facilities within walking and cycling distance of the site.	in excess of 800 metres from the site (10 minutes' walk) that this site would not create a "walking neighbourhoods" which would be truly sustainable.	
Pedestrian/cycle links to the wider area	There is a good level of safe pedestrian and cycle infrastructure between the site and local services and facilities.	The Council considers that whether a route is 'attractive', 'safe' or 'stimulating' is by definition a subjective matter which will vary by degree from person to person.	
Public Transport	Public transport offers a real choice for travel. The site is sustainably located in travel terms.	Whilst the Council acknowledges there presence of a 'hail' bus stop within walking distance of the site the ability for residents of the site to use this service to access employment is limited. The bus service is limited in service Monday to Saturday and does not run at all on Sundays. Additionally the continuation of a half hourly bus service is not guaranteed.	
Whether residents would be wholly reliant on the car	The appellant considers that there are a range of facilities within walking and cycling distance of the Site that will meet many of the every-day needs of Appeal Site residents. The No 2 bus service offers a frequent and quick alternative way of accessing the town centre services. Rail services calling at Citheroe Rail Station offer a non-car travel opportunity to access facilities in larger centres.	The Council considers that the site cannot be considered to be well served by public transport and as such there is limited realistic alternatives to the private car for employment and other needs.	
HOUSING LAND SUPPLY			
Whether evidence since the publication of the HLAS should be used	The Council should not publish the HLAS and then retrospectively seek to provide evidence to support its position in the weeks and months after the document was published.	The Council have included upto date information on housing delivery which it has sourced as part of its continuing monitoring of the housing land supply within the Borough. This work is to enable the HLAS to be updated however the updated HLAS will not be published prior to the Public Inquiry.	

		The data the Council has supplied is used to validate the assumptions made.	
Sites where the annual build rate is disputed	The build out rates are unrealistically high for the following sites: 01. Land at Higher Standen Farm, Clitheroe 02. Land east of Chipping Lane, Longridge	The Council considers that the build out rate for these sites is realistic and achievable.	
Sites where the lead in time before the site will start delivering units is disputed	The lead in times for the following sites are unrealistically short: 03. Land to the south-west of Barrow and west of Whalley Road, Barrow 04. Land off Waddington Road, Clitheroe	The Council considers that the lead in times for these sites is realistic and achievable.	
Sites which are disputed as to whether or not they meet the definition of deliverable	The following sites do not meet the definition of deliverable as set out in the NPPF2019: 05. Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe.	The Council considers that this site does meet the definition of deliverable	
The amount of dwellings that should be considered deliverable from small sites with planning permission	All 300 dwellings that have planning permission should not be considered deliverable. Only 130 dwellings should be considered to be deliverable.	The Council considers that all 300 sites meet the definition of deliverable and therefore should be included within the supply	
Whether compelling evidence exists to justify a windfall allowance	The Council has not provided compelling evidence to justify the inclusion of a small sites windfall allowance in the five year supply.	The windfall allowance is supported by clear and concise evidence over a ten year period. The Council considers that the figure included is conservative.	
Whether the Housing requirement for Clitheroe will be met over the plan	Due to the significant delays in delivery of the Standen Strategic Site the 2,320 dwelling requirement for Clitheroe over the plan period will not be met by completions to date and existing commitments.	The housing requirement for Clitheroe will be reviewed this year as part of the review of the Core Strategy.	

period			
Whether the Affordable Housing requirement will be met over the plan period	The SHMA (2013) identified a net annual need of 404 affordable dwellings per annum. However, the Core Strategy monitors affordable housing against a housing target of 75 units per year (i.e. 1,500 affordable homes over the plan period to 2028). A target of 1,500 affordable dwellings over the plan period will not be met by completions to date and existing commitments.	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 is achievable during the plan period.	