

Supplemental Planning Statement of Common Ground

Hollins Strategic Land and Metacre Ltd.

Appeal A – APP/D2320/W/21/3284692
Land at Carrington Road, Adlington

Appeal B – APP/D2320/W/21/3284702
Land South of Parr Lane Ecclestone

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This additional Statement of Common Ground has been prepared jointly by De Pol Associates on behalf of Metacre Ltd, Sedgwick Associates on behalf of Hollins Strategic Land and Chorley Council.
- 1.2. It has arisen from the issuing of appeal decision letters for residential development at Blainscough Hall, Chorley¹ and sites at Goosnargh, Preston on 03/04/2022. The parties agree that these decisions are significant material considerations in the determination of these appeals.
- 1.3. The appeal at Blainscough Hall (BH) was allowed. The findings of Inspector Helen Hockenhill on housing land supply and whether the most important policies for determining the application were up to date led Chorley Council to withdraw its reasons for refusal of the current appeals: see Chorley Council letter to the Planning Inspectorate dated 4th February 2022.

2. Matters of Agreement

- 2.1. It is agreed that the Standard Method (SM) is to be used to calculate the adequacy of the housing land supply in Chorley, as set out in BH §36. It is therefore agreed that the annual housing requirement for Chorley is 537 dwellings per annum (§30 BH).
- 2.2. The most important policies for determining these appeals are Policy 1 and Policy 4 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy ("CLCS") and Policy BNE3 of the Chorley Local Plan ("CLP").
- 2.3. In assessing whether Policy 4 is up to date an assessment of housing land supply has been carried out. In the light of Inspector Hockenhill's finding that an oversupply from previous years should not be used to offset future housing (BH §52) it is agreed that, based on local housing need using the SM with no accounting for oversupply, the 5-year housing land supply is between 2.4 and 2.6 years. As recorded by the Inspector this means that the Council's land supply is "significantly" below five years (§52 BH). It is therefore agreed that the shortfall is significant.
- 2.4. It follows that the tilted balance is engaged (BH §53), and that the policies most important for determining the application (Policy 1 and 4 of the CLCS and BNE3 of the CLP) are out of date in accordance with NPPF11 and Footnote 8, and §54 BH decision).
- 2.5. Policy 4 is also agreed to be out of date, as it is inconsistent with the local housing need methodology and housing requirement (§54 and 87 BH). It follows that CLP Policy BNE3 (safeguarded land) is also out-of-date. This is because it has been based on the Policy 4 housing requirement, and is for this reason inconsistent with the NPPF (§54 BH and §87 BH). On this basis it is agreed that

¹ APP/D2320/W/21/3275691

CLP Policy BNE3 should be attributed limited weight in the decision-making process (BH §54 and §87 BH).

- 2.6. With there being a significant shortfall in housing land supply it is agreed that significant weight is given to the delivery of housing on the appeal sites and in addition significant weight is given to the delivery of affordable housing on them. The significant weight to be attributed to the supply of housing and affordable housing that will come forward through the appeal schemes is consistent with the Inspector's finding at BH (§88 and §90 – 91).
- 2.7. It is agreed that, applying the tilted balance, there are no adverse impacts associated with the proposals which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole, and that permission should therefore be granted without delay in accordance with NPPF11. It is therefore also a matter of agreement that the material considerations associated with the development outweigh the conflict with Local Plan Policy BNE3, and that permission should be granted applying S38 (6) PCPA.
- 2.8. It is agreed that there is no conflict with any other policies of the development plan, and that there are no site specific or other reasons that justify refusing either appeal scheme. It is therefore agreed that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions and S106 obligations.