

Inspectors Questions on 18.9.2025 and Central Lancashire Authorities' Response (Deadline: 3/10/2025)

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
Habitat Regulation Assessment		
Q1	<p>(a) The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) concludes that site allocations in the Plan may, in combination, lead to the loss of functional habitat for over-wintering birds which are a qualifying species for Coastal SPA and Ramsar Sites. In order to mitigate these impacts the HRA sets out a requirement for overwintering bird surveys on sites identified with moderate potential to support qualifying species, along with a requirement, where necessary, to provide appropriate mitigation. This is addressed in Policy EN7 alongside a requirement for an over-wintering bird survey on affected sites.</p> <p>The HRA identifies that the effects are likely only in combination, having regard to the extent of development proposed in the Plan. Can the Council therefore advise what an overwintering bird survey for an individual site would involve? Assuming that the assessment of the potential of each site in the HRA is accurate, how far would an individual survey need to take account of the likely impacts arising from other proposed sites in order to assess cumulative impact? How does the Council anticipate this will matter will be addressed?</p>	<p>a) Overwintering bird surveys</p> <p>The overwintering bird surveys would need to be done in accordance with national guidance -<u>Protected species and development: advice for local planning authorities - GOV.UK</u> The surveys aim to count all birds encountered and map their distribution on the site and its surroundings and are usually carried out at monthly intervals between October to March.</p> <p>b) Assuming that the assessment of the potential of each site in the HRA is accurate, how far would an individual survey need to take account of the likely impacts arising from other proposed sites in order to assess cumulative impact? How does the Council anticipate this will matter will be addressed?</p> <p>The key points in relation to these surveys are clarified in paragraph 5.36 on pages 50-51 or the Reg.19 HRA (CD07). This describes a need to <i>“take into account the cumulative numbers of SPA and Ramsar site birds affected within the relevant site allocations as they come forward for development”</i>.</p> <p>In terms of how the matter will be addressed, it is clear to applicants which allocated sites require this information. Policies HS2, HS3, HS4, EC2, EC3, EC5, EC6 identify with a ‘#’</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>the allocated sites which require over-wintering bird surveys. The relevant strategic site allocations (SS3, SS5, SS6) also include this detail, as does CD07 (see tables E.1, E.2 and E.3 in Appendix E).</p> <p>Paragraph 5.36 on page 50 of CD07 clarifies the buffer zones required for the SPA sites, e.g. Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar Site require a 2km buffer for all non-allocated sites.</p> <p>Paragraphs 7.45-7.46 of Policy EN7 also clarify that surveys on allocated and non-allocated sites will be required for the relevant bird species for the specific habitat site that they fall within the buffer zone of, and the table beneath clarifies the qualifying bird species.</p> <p>The Councils would defer to Natural England and their own Ecological Advisors on the geographical extent of overwintering bird surveys and how other proposed development sites should be considered to assess cumulative impacts. It is recommended that applicants seek specialist ecological advice.</p>
	<p>b) The HRA also refers to the potential impacts of recreational disturbance on designated sites and ongoing work to identify a Zone of Influence (ZOI) for each of these, which a view to developing a joint programme of mitigation to which developers would be required to contribute. Can the Council advise on whether there has been any progress on these since the HRA was prepared?</p>	<p>b) Recreation impacts and mitigation</p> <p>The Reg.19 HRA (CD07) was not able to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of Habitats Sites in Morecambe Bay and the Sefton Coast; and concluded that the CLAs would need to work with neighbouring authorities and Natural England to establish zones of influence to determine whether there would be adverse effects on integrity. Any agreements, for example</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>on the requirement for mitigation, would be documented in a Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>Following discussion with Natural England, this has moved on; and the latest position is as set out in the Statement of Common Ground with Natural England, dated June 2025 (CLA02).</p> <p>In summary, the current position as set out in the SOCG is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morecambe Bay sites: it is sufficient to include policy wording similar to that suggested by Natural England in their Reg.19 response; i.e. “To help protect the SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites along the coast, the Council will work with local authorities to monitor the progress of ongoing assessments and recreational management studies being undertaken on these sites. Planning permission will only be granted for development that responds to the emerging evidence, the published recommendations, and future related research.” • Sefton Coast sites: Natural England is not concerned about in combination effects on these sites, and they consider existing safeguards to be sufficient. Participation in the Liverpool City Region strategic recreation mitigation strategy is not required. • General advice: reference in the Reg.19 letter to Natural England’s support for new open space / green infrastructure and enhanced provision e.g. for dog walking is intended to be good practice rather than ‘mitigation’ for impacts on specific Habitats Sites.

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>These supersede the conclusions of the Reg.19 HRA. The conclusions of the HRA on recreation pressure are now that there will be no likely significant effects on Habitats Sites on the Sefton Coast due to recreation pressure; and that, in relation to habitats sites in Morecambe Bay, adverse effects on integrity can be ruled out following inclusion of the suggested policy wording. No additional mitigation or developer contributions are required.</p> <p>The next iteration of the HRA can reflect the agreements on recreation pressure and any changes required.</p>
The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy		
Q2	<p>Policy SS2 sets out the settlement hierarchy for development within the Plan. Table 1 identifies settlements in the Plan area and attributes them a position within the hierarchy.</p> <p>(a) Can the Council please provide details of the evidence that was used to assess the position of each settlement within the hierarchy?</p>	<p>(a) The settlement hierarchy stems back from work which underpinned the extant Central Lancashire Core Strategy. The overall strategy was developed to direct new growth and investment to the most sustainable locations within Central Lancashire, and this approach remains relevant in the emerging CLLP. The Core Strategy identified service centres across Central Lancashire from the main Preston/ South Ribble Urban area, to Key Services Centres then down to Local Service Centres (the latter distinguished further between Urban Local Centres and those local centres in more rural areas), with the final level being based on other settlements which are outside the service centre areas and are generally smaller settlements. This approach was set out in Policy 1 of the Core Strategy.</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>Policy SS2 in the CLLP builds upon this existing approach and identifies the role and function of places which reflect the range of services as well as considering level of employment opportunities and how accessible places are. Policy SS2 paragraph 3.13 confirms that Central Lancashire has varied settlements which provide different functions, and in para 3.14 notes the importance of distributing growth accordingly between these settlements.</p> <p>The use of a Settlement Hierarchy in the Local Plan ensures that development is then distributed to and takes place in the most sustainable and appropriate places through a plan-led approach. This is consistent with the policies of the NPPF.</p> <p>In Chorley, the settlement hierarchy is broadly in line with that set out in the Central Lancashire Core Strategy. The only change to Tier 3 in the CLLP, is the addition of Buckshaw Village which was a strategic site in the Core Strategy and has since seen significant development. Croston has been moved from Tier 5 to Tier 4 as it is considered to offer more services and facilities and have better public transport links than the other small villages in Tier 5. Conversely, Brinscall and Withnell have been moved from Tier 4 to Tier 5 as they have fewer services and facilities than the other settlements in Tier 4 and have experienced limited growth over the current plan period.</p> <p>In Preston the only change from the Core Strategy is the reflection of Broughton's recent growth which has moved this settlement from Tier 5 to Tier 4 due to it now being considered</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>to offer more services and improved public transport links to the main urban area.</p> <p>In South Ribble the settlement hierarchy is broadly in line with the Central Lancashire Core Strategy. However, the northern part of the South Ribble Urban area has changed from Tier 1 to Tier 2 in the CLLP. There have been changes to the strategic road infrastructure in this area which has resulted in a greater separation of this area from Preston City Centre. Preston, as the primary focus for growth and investment, has its own tier – Tier 1.</p> <p>In South Ribble, the only change to Tier 3 is the additional inclusion of Longton, which was previously Tier 4. Longton is a much larger settlement than other Tier 4 areas, with a greater range of services and facilities, and with good public transport links. In addition, New Longton and Walmer Bridge have been moved from Tier 5 to Tier 4 as they are considered to offer more services and facilities and have better public transport links than the other small villages in Tier 5.</p>
	<p>(b) Furthermore, can the Council please provide a breakdown of how much development is proposed within each settlement tier?</p>	<p>(b) Please see tables 1 and 2 at the end of this document which set out the proposed housing and employment development by settlement tier for the remainder of the plan period (1st April 2025 to 31st March 2041).</p> <p>Housing For Chorley, please note that the housing supply figures do not include supply from small windfall sites with planning</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>permission (less than 10 dwellings) or from the windfall allowance. An assumption is made for proposed development over the plan period from small windfall sites with planning permission, but this figure has not been broken down by settlement. The windfall allowance has not been broken down by settlement as the locations of these windfall sites are not yet known. The housing supply in the Green Belt relates to sites with planning permission.</p> <p>For South Ribble, the housing supply figures do not include the windfall allowance because the locations of these windfall sites cannot be known. All other sites in the housing supply, including small sites with permission, are included and broken down by settlement tier as relevant.</p> <p>Within Chorley and South Ribble, the tables illustrate higher housing numbers in Tier 5 than Tier 4. However, this is reflective of the availability of land in those areas and a greater number of settlements in Tier 5 than Tier 4. Also, some of these numbers relate to sites already granted planning permission. Some growth in rural villages and hamlets is considered suitable and sustainable.</p> <p>Housing supply in Preston is made up of sites with extant planning permission and proposed allocations, there is no windfall allowance assumed for meeting Preston's Housing need over the plan period, however, Preston's Housing Land Position Paper does note windfall sites make a contribution to overall supply against the current plan allocations. However,</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>this supply is not relied upon to meet Preston's housing requirements over the plan period as sufficient sites have been identified to meet this need.</p> <p>The development in Preston is principally in Tier 1, with 87% of the areas housing development expected in the main Urban Area. There are no settlements in Preston in Tier 2. Preston only has one settlement in Tier 3 which is Longridge. Development here consists of planned development of allocations in the existing local Plan and new allocations proposed as a plan led extension to the settlement in the CLLP.</p> <p>Tier 4 in Preston includes an existing allocation on the edge of Grimsargh as well as unplanned development on the edge of Broughton at Keyfold farm which was awarded permission on appeal. The only new allocation in Tier 4 is a small allocation of eight dwellings within the settlement boundary of Broughton. Tier 5 has no new allocations, however it does have an existing allocation with Planning permission on a large brownfield site formerly occupied by Whittingham Hospital. The remaining sites allocated are windfall sites with extant permission, two of which were awarded on appeal.</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>In terms of the South Ribble employment land supply, 52ha is identified within the Samlesbury Enterprise Zone (SEZ). A Local Development Order (LDO) applies to the SEZ, which continues to recognise the strategic employment importance of the site. The site is not contained within a settlement tier.</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>In Chorley, the proposed employment development in the Green Belt largely relates to permitted development on existing industrial estates/employment sites.</p> <p>In Preston, employment land is mainly within Tier 1. Preston East is the main employment area and this sits adjacent to the main urban area. This employment area does not sit within a settlement.</p> <p>Summary The tables below, taken as a whole, indicate growth across Central Lancashire accords with the principles set out in the spatial strategy, with 78% of all housing development and over 64% of employment land located within Tiers 1 and 2 in line with the councils' spatial strategy to locate growth in the most sustainable locations. In addition, a further 32% of employment land is located within established employment areas at Preston East and Samlesbury Enterprise Zone, both of which are located outside of the settlement hierarchy tiers but are key employment zones and considered primary locations for growth.</p>
	<p>c) Please also advise of when the boundary for each settlement was last reviewed?</p>	<p>c) The need to review the boundaries of each settlement has been considered in the preparation of the submission plan.</p> <p>In Chorley and South Ribble, all settlements, with the exception of Chorley Town, are surrounded by Green Belt. Through the Local Plan process it has been evidenced that</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>housing and employment needs can be met without the need to release Green Belt, therefore no changes have been made to these settlement boundaries.</p> <p>In relation to the settlement boundary for the town of Chorley, this is a proposed amendment in the submission plan to take account of the proposed allocations to the east of the town.</p> <p>In Preston, the Tier 1 settlement boundary has been updated to reflect the development of strategic sites in the adopted Core Strategy and adopted Local Plan, as well as to allow further expansion of the Main Urban Area of Preston for sustainable growth through the CLLP. The new boundary is now reflective of the River Ribble and Green Belt to the south, M6 to East, M55 to the North and Edith Rigby Way to the west inclusive of the outline boundary of the approved Bartle Garden Village development (06/2020/0888), all of which are considered to provide logical barriers for growth of this settlement.</p> <p>In Tier 3, land is proposed for allocation on the edge of Longridge and the settlement boundary in this area has been amended to reflect that.</p> <p>In Preston's rural settlements (Tiers 4 and 5), boundaries have been updated to reflect where development has been granted permission adjacent to the existing settlement boundaries and which are in the process of being built out.</p>
Neighbourhood Plans		
Q3	a) The Local Development Scheme provides details of the made Neighbourhood Plans in the Plan area. Please provide details of	There are no made Neighbourhood Plans in Chorley. There is one made plan in South Ribble but this contains no

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
	<p>any allocations within these Plans which contribute to the Plan's housing supply.</p>	<p>allocations. In Preston, there are four made plans, but only one (Broughton) with allocations which have either been built out or are no longer supported by the parish council in their neighbourhood plan review work.</p> <p>Therefore, there are no allocations in any neighbourhood plan which contribute to the plan's housing supply.</p> <p>In Preston there are four made plans in existence and one designated area. Broughton Neighbourhood Plan, which was Made in October 2018 has allocations within it, however these have since been built out or are no longer available. The other Neighbourhood Plans have not wanted to allocate land for development within their areas above what has been identified by the extant Local Plan given the level of development allocated to their parish. There are no allocations in any extant Neighbourhood Plan currently contributing to the Council's housing supply.</p> <p>The Broughton Neighbourhood Plan is currently under review by the Parsh Council. The current Plan allocations have been built out or are no longer promoted for development and do not feature in the draft Plan which the Parish Council recently consulted on. Land has been promoted outside of the defined settlement boundary in this area to the Parish Council, however the Council's position is that no additional large scale growth is required in this area outside the settlement boundary to support the Council in meeting its housing requirement for the reasons set out above, and the CLLP only allocates a small</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>plot of land within the existing settlement boundary of Broughton.</p> <p>The Woodplumpton Neighbourhood Plan was Made in February 2024 and spans the Council areas of Preston City Council and Wyre Council. There are no housing allocations made within this Plan and discussion with the Parish Council have indicated no appetite for allocating land for development.</p> <p>It is recognised that North West Preston Development sits within Broughton and Woodplumpton, and both areas include reference to this development in their respective Neighbourhood Plans, and the Parish Councils are supportive on the CLLP approach of not allocating any additional housing need to these areas based on the scale of development already committed.</p> <p>The Grimsargh Neighbourhood Plan has not progressed beyond application phase, however discussion with the Parish Council have indicated no appetite for allocating land for development.</p> <p>The Barton Neighbourhood Plan was Made in December 2023 with no allocations made within the Plan and the Parish support the approach of directing development to the main urban area.</p> <p>The Inner East Preston Neighbourhood Plan is Preston's only non-parish designated neighbourhood area. The</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>Neighbourhood Plan was Made in April 2015 with no allocations made within the plan. The Qualifying Body has not re-engaged since the plan was Made. This area is already heavily developed being on the edge of the City Centre. Even though it is within Tier 1, there were no potential development opportunities identified within this designated area.</p>
	<p>(b) Please also provide details of where the housing requirement for each neighbourhood area as set out in paragraph 69 of the NPPF 2024 is provided in the evidence base.</p>	<p>(b) Paragraph 69 of the NPPF requires strategic polices to set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations. Paragraph 70 states that "where it is not possible to provide a requirement figure for a neighbourhood area, the local planning authority should provide an indicative figure, if requested to do so by the neighbourhood planning body."</p> <p>The CLLP does not include a housing requirement for the designated neighbourhood areas in Central Lancashire because of one or more of the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the groups/parish council has not requested a figure • they have confirmed that they do not intend to propose allocations in their plans • they have confirmed that they no longer wish to progress with a neighbourhood plan • there is no land deemed suitable and in accordance with the CLLP's spatial strategy for development in the designated area.

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic sites are allocated within the Neighbourhood Area and sufficient housing is allocated through the delivery of those sites, • Recent permissions in the Neighbourhood Area are considered sufficient to meet the areas need. <p><u>Preston Designated Neighbourhood Areas</u> In Preston, as noted in response to Q3(a) only Broughton Neighbourhood Plan has allocated land for development in a Made plan.</p> <p>Throughout the development of the Plan, PCC have regularly attended the Preston Area Committee (PAC) to provide updates on the plan, this group is made up of all parished areas in Preston and includes membership of all parishes where there is a Neighbourhood Plan. Through the PAC, the Council has discussed the housing need arising from the plan and how/where that would be met. Through this group, the councils gained direct feedback from the rural parishes on their view regarding specific housing requirements for the parished areas and discussed the approach being taken to allocate housing need across the plan area. The Parish Councils have been clear on their view of the need for the plan to allocate any specific housing requirement to those areas outside any defined settlement boundaries.</p> <p>The extant Preston Local Plan includes significant housing development in the Parishes of Woodplumpton and Broughton which is referred to in both Neighbourhood Plans and was a</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>driving force in Neighbourhood Plans coming forward in those areas. The key development site in the Preston Local Plan, North West Preston (MD2) lies within the Parish of Woodplumpton principally as well as extending into Broughton, with development in these areas located within the Preston main urban area, and entirely within Tier 1. This allocation provided for approximately 5,300 dwellings and associated infrastructure. This allocation continues into the CLLP, with an estimated 841 dwellings still to be completed as of April 2025.</p> <p>Within the CLLP, a further 1,100 dwellings are allocated at Bartle Garden Village which falls within Woodplumpton Parish along with smaller parcels which connect Bartle Garden Village and the previous MD2 allocation together in this new large allocation of SS3, adding a potential 397 further dwellings (1,497 in total) within the Parish of Woodplumpton. Collectively, allocations in the Parishes of Broughton and Woodplumpton come to 2,535 dwellings as of April 2025 all of which falls within Tier 1. The CLLP therefore did not consider there to be any additional housing requirement outside of Tier 1 within those parish areas, this approach has been supported by the Parishes who were clear they did not wish to see any additional ask on them to be met within the more rural areas of the parish outside of Tier 1.</p> <p>The Council have worked closely with Broughton Parish Council on the review of their Neighbouring plan (Currently at Regulation 14). Whilst Broughton have aspirations to allocate</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>additional land outside the settlement boundary in their recent consultation on the basis of additional community benefits from that development, however Preston Council have been clear they have not identified a need for housing growth in this area given the high number of dwellings permitted in recent years and the continued delivery of development in North West Preston. For this reason, no housing need has been identified for the Parish of Broughton.</p> <p>Therefore, the CLLP does not set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas, but the local planning authorities would provide an indicative figure if it were requested by a neighbourhood planning body.</p>
Housing Land Supply		
Q4	<p>The Housing Land Supply Position Statement from South Ribble contains information on the lead in times between the receipt of outline, reserved matters, and full applications and the completion of the first units and also on average build out rates. Is similar information for Chorley and Preston in the evidence base, and if not please can this be provided? This should be based on major applications (i.e. 10 or more dwellings). It would be helpful if this could be broken down by size of site i.e. 10-49, 50-99, and 100+ dwellings, particularly for the build out rates.</p>	<p>This information is provided in tables 3,4 and 5.</p> <p>Response for Chorley</p> <p>The Councils previously provided the Inspectors with a Housing Trajectory Assumptions paper (MO08). Chorley Council used this paper as a guide to inform delivery assumptions within the housing trajectory where no information had been provided by site promoters. The lead in times and build out rates within this paper are broken down by site size.</p> <p>For the majority of sites, information was obtained from the site promoter. Prior to the Regulation 19 consultation, a site promoter survey was carried out to seek information from site promoters regarding timescales for development, expected</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>build out rates and if a planning application had not yet been submitted, what site assessment works had been undertaken. This information was used to inform the trajectory in the Regulation 19 Local Plan. The trajectory has been updated with a base date of 1st April 2025, and as part of the update all site promoters were contacted again to seek updated information.</p> <p>Where no information was received from site promoters, the data in the Housing Trajectory Assumptions paper was used as a starting point to determine development timescales and build out rates. Site specific considerations were also taken into account when determining the assumptions to be applied to each site, for example whether there are any constraints that may result in longer development timescales or lower build out rates. Recent completions rates on nearby sites or on other sites being developed by the same developer were also considered.</p> <p>The delivery assumptions for large sites (50+ dwellings) in the paper are based on information contained in the 'Start to Finish' report updated and re-published by Lichfields in September 2024. This document is considered to provide robust information on average development lead in times and build out rates for large sites as it is based on detailed analysis of a large number of housing developments across the country. It is widely used by Council's to inform housing trajectories.</p> <p>An exercise was undertaken to compare this average data to lead in times and build out rates for recent developments in</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>Chorley of 50-99 dwellings and 100-499 dwellings (see Table 3). There have been no recent developments of 500 or more dwellings in Chorley. As was the case with the South Ribble data, the findings for Chorley developments were broadly in line with the findings in the Lichfields paper. The total planning approval periods are similar however the average planning to delivery periods in Chorley are quicker than those in the Lichfields paper. Overall, the total time to first completions is shorter in Chorley than the Lichfields paper. Build out rates are higher for developments in Chorley of 50-99 dwellings, but slightly lower for developments of 100-499 dwellings than identified in the Lichfields paper. The assessment of Chorley developments is provided in Table 3. Table 4 summarises the findings of the Lichfields paper.</p> <p>In Chorley there has not been a large number of applications for major housing developments in recent years due to the majority of housing allocations in the adopted Local Plan now being developed. The Lichfields data is therefore considered robust as it is based on a larger number of developments. It also provides a more cautious approach given the overall lead in times identified in Chorley on recent developments are shorter.</p> <p>The delivery assumptions for sites of less than 50 dwellings in the trajectory are based on recent development timescales and build out rates in Chorley. The Lichfields paper does not include data on sites of less than 50 dwellings.</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		<p>This explanation provides the rationale for the use of the Lichfields time periods in the trajectory for Chorley's developments where no information was provided by the site promoter.</p> <p>Response for Preston As noted for Chorley, the same assumptions apply to the housing trajectories for Preston, and the assumptions in Housing Trajectory Assumptions paper (MO08) are only used in the absence of information from the developers (except for apartment schemes). Site specific considerations have also been taken into account, specifically for brownfield land schemes within the City Centre where development progress can be impacted by funding, this can both speed up and delay delivery.</p> <p>We apply different considerations to apartment schemes as the development can only be occupied when all units are complete and this can therefore impact on delivery. These are also points noted in the Lichfields study. In these circumstances, experience has shown that there is no standard approach that can be applied to these schemes and local knowledge is key in considering how such schemes will progress and therefore this can affect any average delivery assumptions for the city.</p> <p>In most cases, Preston Council use direct information from developers/site promoters, where responses are late or not forthcoming, the council use past delivery rates on the scheme</p>

Ref No.	Question	CLA's Response
		to project what is likely to be delivered over the 5 year period. Preston do not include schemes in the 5YHLS which do not have at least outline planning permission

Table 1 Proposed Housing Development by Settlement Tier - 1st April 2025 – 31st March 2041

Settlement Tier	Chorley	Preston	South Ribble	Total	% of total
Tier 1 – Preston Urban Area	N/A	9,501	N/A	9,501	44.54
Tier 2 – Key Service Centres	1,657	0	5,393	7,050	33.05
Tier 3 – Urban Local Service Centres	1,941	294	308	2,543	11.92
Tier 4 – Rural Local Service Centres	107	209 ¹	147	463	2.17
Tier 5 – Smaller Rural Villages and Hamlets	339	942 ²	286	1,567	7.35
Green Belt	37	0	168	205	0.96
TOTAL	4,081	10,946	6,302	21,329	100

¹ Includes Keyfold Farm In Broughton permitted on Appeal

² Includes 2 sites - Homes England development of Brownfield land at Whittingham Hospital allocated through the extant Core Strategy and Land at Cardwell Park which was granted planning permission on appeal. No new allocations identified in the CLLP.

Table 2 Proposed Employment Development by Settlement Tier (Ha) - 1st April 2025 – 31st March 2041

Settlement Tier	Chorley	Preston	South Ribble	Total (Ha)	% of total
Tier 1 – Preston Urban Area	N/A	86.25	N/A	86.25	27.68
Tier 2 – Key Service Centres	22.19	0	92.36	114.55	36.76
Tier 3 – Urban Local Service Centres	0.57	0	0	0.57	0.18
Tier 4 – Rural Local Service Centres	1.19	0	0.6	1.79	0.57
Tier 5 – Smaller Rural Villages and Hamlets	0.17	0	0	0.17	0.05
Other*	0	50.25	0	50.25	16.13
Green Belt	6.03	0	0	6.03	1.94
Enterprise Zone (LDO)	0	0	52	52	16.69
TOTAL	30.15	136.50	144.96	311.61	100

*Preston East Employment area sits on the edge of the Preston main urban area but as it is separated by the M6 it does not form part of the main urban area settlement. It sits between the main urban area and the settlement of Grimsargh. This area is not classed as being within a settlement tier in the hierarchy due the fragility of the settlement gap between Grimsargh and the main urban area of Preston and is classed as Other land. However, in priority areas for employment growth this area sits adjacent to the main urban area for Preston and above the lower tier settlements.

Table 3: Chorley Development Lead in Times and Build Out Rates (based on historic data)

Site Size (dwellings)	Average time to obtain outline consent (years)	Average time to obtain detailed consent (years)	Total Planning Approval Period (years)	Average Planning to Delivery Period (years)	Total Time to First Completion	Average Annual Build Out Rate
10-49	-	-	1.4	1.7	3.1	24
50-99	-	-	1.9	1.3	3.2	33
100-499	1.2	1.8	3	1.2	4.2	45

Table 4: Lichfields Development Lead in Times and Build Out Rates

Site Size (dwellings)	Average time to obtain outline consent (years)	Average time to obtain detailed consent (years)	Total Planning Approval Period (years)	Average Planning to Delivery Period (years)	Total Time to First Completion	Average Annual Build Out Rate
50-99	-	-	1.5	2.3	3.8	20
100-499	1.2	1.6	2.8	3.2	6	49

Table 5: Preston Development Lead in Times and Build Out Rates (based on historic data)

Site Size (dwellings)	Average time to obtain outline consent (years)	Average time to obtain reserved matters consent (years)	Average time to obtain outline consent & reserved matters (years)	Average time to obtain full consent (years)	Average time to obtain planning Approval (outline + reserved matters or full) (years)	Average Planning to Delivery Period (years)	Total Time to First Completion	Average Annual Build Out Rate
10-49	0.4	0.3	0.7	1.1	0.9	2.1	3	9
50-99	0.9	0.4	1.3	0.8	1.05	1.6	2.65	23
100+	1.4	0.5	1.9	0.8	1.35	1.7	3.05	35
1000+	1.1	0.4	1.5	n/a	1.5	2	3.5	39

