

Report of	Meeting	Date
Central Lancashire Planning Local Plan Coordinator	Central Lancashire Strategic Planning Joint Advisory Committee	25.01.2021

CENTRAL LANCASHIRE LOCAL PLAN ISSUES & OPTIONS OUTCOMES

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. To endorse publication of the Outcomes Reports
2. To agree to notifying stakeholders that the outcomes reports have been published on the Central Lancashire Local Plan Website
3. To write to schools/colleges to thank them for responding to the youth questionnaire and invite to continue to engage with us going forward.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT

4. The Central Lancashire Local Plan Issues and options report was consulted upon for 12 weeks from Monday 18th November 2019 until Friday 14th February 2020. The consultation was in the form of an Issues and Options Document, supported by a series of detailed Annexes, 4 of which contained information on the site suggestions received for each of the 3 Councils.
5. We received over 1,600 responses to this consultation which have been logged and reviewed by the Central Lancashire Local Plan team. The responses received have been used in the preparation of a consultation outcomes report, and will be used to help develop the Preferred Options Document
6. A youth Questionnaire was also published alongside the main consultation and links sent to local education establishments and youth groups to encourage them to get involved in shaping the area in which they live. We received nearly 600 responses from across the area and some useful information which will help inform the development of the Plan.

Confidential report Please bold as appropriate	Yes	No
--	-----	----

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)

(If the recommendations are accepted)

7. To enable continued development of the Central Lancashire Local Plan.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

8. NA

Background

9. The Central Lancashire Local Plan Issues and Options report was consulted upon for 12 weeks from Monday 18th November 2019 until Friday 14th February 2020. The consultation was in the form of an Issues and Options Document which contained 68 questions of which respondents were free to choose which ones to answer. This was supported by a series of detailed Annexes, 4 of which contained information on the site suggestions submitted to each Council for consideration. Annex 1 and 5 provided details of site suggestions submitted across Chorley, Annex 3 for Preston and Annex 4 for South Ribble.
10. The consultation was hosted online through Citizen Space and stakeholders were encouraged to engage this way. It was also supported by a series of 40 drop-in sessions, with one session held in each ward in Chorley, in each My Neighbourhood area in South Ribble, and at selected locations across Preston. Hard copies of documents were also placed in agreed deposit points across Central Lancashire.

Response rate

11. We received a total of 1,616 responses to the Issues and Options consultation (47% from Chorley, 31% South Ribble and 4% of which were from Preston residents). 1,200 responses came directly through Citizen Space, with the remainder in letter from both handwritten and electronic. Disappointingly, the key statutory stakeholders still engaged in paper format, albeit email, as did the majority of developers and agents representing them. We also received 4 petitions relating to a number of specific proposals, 2 of which related to suggestions in Chorley in regard to sites put forward in Bretherton and Brindle and 2 to suggestions in South Ribble in regard to sites put forward in the Coup Green and Gregson Lane, and New Longton and Hutton East Wards.
12. A total of 912 people signed into the drop in events across Central Lancashire. A specific breakdown by ward/neighbourhood area for those attending events across central Lancashire is provided in Tables 1 – 3 below. Through attendance at the drop ins, we obtained an additional 510 stakeholders registering on the database for the Local Plan, and a further 725 also registered as a result of accessing the consultation through Citizen Space.

Table 1: Attendance at Chorley District Council drop-in sessions by ward.

Number Attendees	Council	Ward	%
4	Chorley	Brindle and Hoghton	0.55%
10	Chorley	Euxton North	1.37%
4	Chorley	Clayton-le-Woods North	0.55%
10	Chorley	Pennine	1.37%
1	Chorley	Chorley South West	0.14%
32	Chorley	Heath Charnock and Rivington	4.40%
275	Chorley	Wheelton and Withnell	37.77%
8	Chorley	Lostock (Bretherton, Croston and Ulnes Walton)	1.10%
59	Chorley	Eccleston and Mawdesley	8.10%
58	Chorley	Adlington and Anderton	7.97%
19	Chorley	Chisnall (covering Charnock Richard, Heskin and Coppull West)	2.61%

Number Attendees	Council	Ward	%
7	Chorley	Chorley North East	0.96%
47	Chorley	Coppull	6.46%
6	Chorley	Astley and Buckshaw	0.82%
16	Chorley	Chorley East	2.20%
12	Chorley	Chorley Town Centre	1.65%
79	Chorley	Euxton South	10.85%
15	Chorley	Chisnall (covering Charnock Richard, Heskin and Coppull West	2.06%
4	Chorley	Chorley North West	0.55%
10	Chorley	Clayton-le-Woods West and Cuerden	1.37%
50	Chorley	Clayton-le-Woods and Whittle-le-Woods	6.87%
2	Chorley	Chorley South East	0.27%

Table 2: Attendance at Preston City Council drop-in sessions by ward.

Number Attendees	Council	Ward
4	Preston	City Centre
8	Preston	City Centre
5	Preston	Ashton & Lea
2	Preston	Fulwood/Redscar
13	Preston	Preston North West
5	Preston	City Centre

Table : Attendance at South Ribble District drop-in sessions by My Neighbourhood Area.

Number Attendees	Council	My Neighbourhood Area
17	South Ribble	Leyland
33	South Ribble	Eastern
7	South Ribble	Bamber Bridge, Lostock Hall & Walton-Le-Dale
12	South Ribble	Penwortham
29	South Ribble	Western
49	South Ribble	Bamber Bridge, Lostock Hall & Walton-Le-Dale

13. The drop in event were helpful in publicising the Local plan, and social media presence in these areas bolstered this through sharing information with local groups and raising awareness of the consultation. Council's local Comms teams also assisted with focused posts on social media platforms advertising the consultation and how to find out more as well as alerting people to the events taking place.
14. However, even with the events and hard copies of consultation materials being available to view at deposit points, there was still a concern that the consultation was too focused towards digital engagement online, which is stated to have alienated a large proportion of the residents in the area.

15. Parish councils also criticised this approach stating it impacted on their ability to engage effectively, especially in the more rural areas where meeting locations do not support internet access. These comments have been noted for future stages of the plan.
16. However, it is worth noting that the Planning White paper is clear that future engagement on planning matters should be done digitally and is pressing for councils to do more online engagement to ensure fair access to planning matters for all local residents. This contrasts with the findings of this engagement and is a matter which will need careful consideration going forward.
17. The Youth Questionnaire received 593 responses to the online questionnaire. The majority of responses coming from students in Preston (69%), with 21% from South Ribble and 4% from Chorley. This responses level is due to the schools/colleges in those area engaging more with the questionnaire and encouraging their pupils to respond, as was stated in a number of the responses. The youth engagement is thought to have worked well and has generated a good level of insightful responses. However, we need to push harder to get all schools involved and will look to build on the success of this stage in future engagement work.

Summary of key themes – Issues and options

18. The questions in the Issues and Options Report where set out across 7 sections, within which questions were posed around issues to be explored. The summary below is presented in line with this

Section 1: Vision and Objections

19. The majority of responses (76%) felt that the vision and objectives as written would not reflect the needs of the area. A number of suggestions for changes were received and have been captured. Residents main concern was to do with what they perceived as over development of the area and the need to protect existing land and assets and to keep green areas green.
20. Linked to this was the clear recognition of the need for the plan to embed the principles of climate change throughout in order to have any chance in delivering change, with many stating that building more would be counterproductive to this, especially where it meant the loss of green spaces and existing trees etc. Issues from residents in Preston were raised around poor air quality in Fulwood, along with request to reduce use of cars by providing better access in and around Preston and beyond to neighbouring cities, through improved public transport – specifically rail infrastructure, the latter points also being raised by responses from all 3 areas.
21. More focus on the economic ambition of the area was requested, it is not all about housing, we also need better employment opportunities, and referencing to delivering the City Deal was highlighted in a number of responses from developers, with them seeking to see South Ribble and Preston play an important role in the economic development of Lancashire.
22. Specific mention was made in relation to South Ribble need to provide a variety of employment facilities and a range of locations, to suit changing needs over the plan

period, and for Chorley to also ensure employment was provided alongside housing due to concerns area becoming a commuter town. There was also a clear concern from all sectors on existing infrastructure provision and the need to improve this, as well as a drive to promote more sustainable development and travel opportunities.

Section 2: Delivering Homes

23. This section contained 10 questions and received a considerable level of response. The first 4 questions were focused on housing delivery and level of housing to be provided. The response from residents on this was as expected, with many concerned that the level of existing building was too high and better use should be made of existing empty homes/buildings and underused commercial areas before building more. There is also concern that we are not building the right type of homes, and what is being built is not for those currently living in the area.
24. More evidence was requested to support allocation of land for future housing needs, with many residents stating their area had already provided more than its fair share, this comment was shared by residents in all 3 council areas, but particularly those that have seen high levels of development in recent years. In contrast, developers and agents questioned the numbers being high enough, particularly when factoring in City Deal. There was concern that the economic assessment of housing need was insufficient and further work was needed to make the Icen report robust.
25. Points also focused on the need to protect areas of open space and the green belt, as well as the character of our rural towns and villages, and to improve infrastructure provision in all areas. This latter point is an issue identified throughout the report. This section also noted comments about the need for fair distribution of housing allocations across central Lancashire and if housing has to be delivered, it should be to meet a specific local need. Specific requests from all areas was for more affordable housing
26. Residents of all three areas noted the need for infrastructure, specifically schools and medicals facilities to be properly considered. This was a particular concern for those in more rural areas where infrastructure is already deemed lacking.
27. Residents of Preston noted a need for more city centre housing where high rise developments/apartment living could meet a localised need, Town centre locations and empty buildings/brownfield sites were suggested across all authority areas as potentially offering better options than rural sites due to infrastructure being in existence in those locations. Specific site locations for Preston included the city centre (with Stoneygate noted) and its outskirts where sustainable travel options could also be maximised. For Chorley included Camelot and Botany Bay, as well as expanding Buckshaw further, and in South Ribble specific site locations included development of the Cuerden site, as well as expanding Buckshaw further, however there may be less benefits to South Ribble housing numbers for development on Buckshaw.
28. There was also concern raised across Central Lancashire that there is not enough homes being planned for the aging population of the area and there is a real need for more bungalows in the area to meet this need.

Student accommodation

29. It is generally felt that level of student accommodation is sufficient, however a student zone would be beneficial to the welfare of students. Recognition given to the importance of UCLAN to the economics of the City of Preston.

Gypsy and Travellers

30. The need for permanent sites and transit sites received the same response as people do not equate the differences between these. There was general concern regarding provision of sites in the plan and how such sites would be managed to ensure the needs of the travelling communities and those already living in the area can be met.

Section 3: Economic growth, employment, education, and skills

31. There were 15 questions in this section covering economic growth and employment land provision, education and skills, the role of town centres and policies to protect them, and leisure and cultural needs of the area.

Economic growth and jobs

32. There is support for developing the economic potential of Central Lancashire, with suggestions on specific sectors to grow, as well as more support to help existing and establish new SME's. It was noted that we already have a number of successful sectors and should build on this and help these industries develop further. Travel links into the Preston city centre was noted as needing improvement as this was affecting business moving there and attracting workers.
33. Accessible brownfield sites were suggested as future locations for growth across all 3 authorities , with the docks and M6/M65 corridors expanding Red Scar noted for Preston alongside Preston Summit and the City Centre with a focus on the Stoneygate area and UCLan/Cardinal Newman expansion, the vacant Cuerden site and making use of the Samlesbury Enterprise Zone noted for South Ribble and Camelot for Chorley. In all cases this should be linked back to the needs identified in the Employment Land Study.
34. Responses were keen to see opportunities developed for graduates, and for the plan to seek to attract business which could benefit from the success of UCLan, currently it was noted that Preston only managed to retain 22% of its graduates compared to 51% in Manchester (dated quoted was sourced as the LEP work on the Local Industrial Strategy).
35. There was a push for green economy jobs to be created in the area and building on the success of Preston Model to support local businesses. It was also noted that Chorley Council had directly invested in their area through the developments at Strawberry Fields digital hub and more investment like this was highlighted. Responses in South Ribble were keen to see manufacturing returning to the area and developing a hub for this and opportunities for our graduates to stay in the area, as well as more apprenticeship opportunities. Building on the success of key business in the area such as BAE were noted.
36. Responses also noted the need for Preston to be the centre for investment in economy for Central Lancashire to ensure it gets the transport improvements needed.

37. Similar to responses to homes, employment sites need to be in sustainable locations and with access to public transport, especially where encouraging increases in apprenticeships. Locations around the M6/M65/M61 junctions were suggested, alongside Preston Summit Preston City centre with focus on the Stoneygate area and UCLan/Cardinal Newman expansion.

Education

38. There was concern over lack of capacity of schools, particularly secondary, in the area, this need was felt across all 3 Council areas. The areas of Whittle-le-Woods in Chorley and Leyland town centre were specifically noted for this requirement. There is also a concern around a lack of Primary places in areas of NW Preston where considerable development has taken place and school space provision has not kept up with demand, as well as need for investment in existing schools serving the City Centre which are underperforming.
39. Stakeholders commented on the need for greater collaboration with existing business to develop partnerships with education establishments and link up skills required to courses/apprenticeships offered, as well as a need for priority of jobs to those living locally.

District/Town Centres

40. Responses highlighted the need for investment in our town and district centres. Comments also suggested there is a need to move away from retail led development, and a need to make our areas a destination people want to visit like parts of Greater Manchester have achieved. It was also noted that there is a need to improve the appearance of our centres, with more dedicated community areas and green spaces.
41. On the boundary changes proposed, the following specific comments came in for the areas as follows
42. For South Ribble
- Extend the Walton le Dale local Centre to include the petrol station on Victoria Road, the White Bull pub at the end of Church Brow, and the shops at the end of Chorley Road opposite.
 - No increase in retail development around School Lane/Chapel Lane/Liverpool Rd.
 - Proposed retail boundaries in Longton would be unnecessary.
 - Add Moss Side and Midge Hall.
43. For Chorley
- Keep Chorley town Centre concentrated.
 - The Chorley Whittle-Le-Woods local Centre should not be deallocated.
 - Lancaster Lane proposal, further expansion will be difficult in this area without changes to the junction.

- Do not remove the Asda store from Chorley Town Centre Boundary – the increased footfall and wider spin offs benefit the town.

44. Preston.

- Support for the contraction of Preston/decommissioning Church St from the Primary shopping area. There is a need to regenerate Church Street.
- The reduction in Preston City Centre is welcomed, but it could be taken further – for example removing the part of Friargate between Ringway and UCLAN, and the Market cinema development. Queens Retail Park should also be reconsidered. The area facing the bus station (Tithebarn Street) should be included.
- The area of Fulwood along Garstang Road / Lytham Road needs more of a retail element.
- Cottam Village Centre (Cottam Brickworks) / NW Preston needs adding.

Across Central Lancashire there is support for the use of thresholds to protect the viability of our town and district centres.

45. In Preston, responses felt that access to the City Centre was holding it back, with improvements needed to walking, cycling and public transport options. A focus on exhibition/entertainment venues also suggested. There is also a request for more support for SME's and in Chorley, improvements to the market to reignite the market town status of the area.
46. Residents feel a strong connection to the identify and heritage in the towns and villages and want to see that enhanced. There is clear support for improving the evening and weekend economy, with requests for more entertainment venues and sport/leisure offerings which are lacking in the town and city centres across Central Lancashire, with suggestions for more residential development above business premises to help support this, and more apartment living in Preston City Centre. There is also a request for more support for SME's. It is also noted that with out of town shopping centres offering free parking, our local centres have suffered.

Section 4: Transport and how we travel

47. This section of the report contained 11 questions covering active travel, reducing the number of vehicles on the roads, public transport, and infrastructure.

Public transport

48. In response to how we can make travel safer and encourage more active/sustainable travel, a key point raised by all was to design places to reduce the need to travel in the first place. There is a clear wish for an improved public transport system with more frequent services and improved access points (new stations/bus stops), with requests for new stations in Cottam and reopening Midge Hall in South Ribble and Coppull Station in Chorley. Improved connections between transport hubs in the city centre and towards the University noted in Preston and with better integrated timings of services in Chorley between the train and bus station. Trams were also suggested to service areas not on the train lines.

49. Requests for better bus services requested across all three to connect the centre and employment locations better. Consideration of free hop on/off serving the city centre and university was also noted, alongside more free park and ride at train stations across Central Lancashire. There were comments made that Preston fared badly on affordable parking at train stations compared with Leyland and Chorley areas, forcing people into cars. It was also suggested that more direct bus routes should be offered from Preston towards Leyland and Chorley and vice versa.
50. More frequent bus services are also needed as currently not seen a viable option when it can take so much longer, with better services for the two hospitals also requested. More park and ride facilities were also mentioned to reduce car journeys into town centres.

Parking

51. Parking provision was not an issue, with most people who responded stating the level of parking was sufficient overall, although specialised provision (disabled/parent/EV) was noted as lacking. In regards to the question on Preston specifically, some responses stated reduce parking in the centre should be considered to encourage less travel by car. More on street charging provision was also highlighted as needed with many respondents noted the need for the plan to do more to support the move towards EV.

Cycling

52. There is a noted lack of adequate cycling facilities across the borough and requests that all new developments address this to enable more people to cycle to work and to store bikes safely at transport hubs. There are also requests for better/safer cycling a walking routes, with these being used to connect areas better.
53. Town centres were noted as lacking in general in cycle parking/safe storage facilities (with the exception being Preston Station) with very few cycle points provided which was seen as key reason for cyclist not choosing to take bikes into town centres etc.

Section 5: Improving health and well-being

54. This section of the consultation contained 12 questions covering issues around obesity, active design of areas and providing healthy neighbourhoods. It was noted that there are recognisable inequalities across Central Lancashire, and past design of areas has influenced this, so there is an opportunity to improve the situation through the Local Plan.

Health Facilities

55. There was support raised for the need to protect A&E services at Chorley Hospital to reduce pressure on Royal Preston and more localised health centres where demand is known to be increasing due to planned development.

Control on fast food outlets

56. There is support for more control over fast food outlets in town centres and in general a need for better education on healthy lifestyles and provision of more facilities to support this, as well as providing more opportunities for people to grow their own food. There is concern that there are too many fast food outlets in Chorley town centre and Preston city centre. In regard to the latter it was commented that this makes the area look run down and puts people off visiting. There is concern that new fast food outlets should not be located near to schools, the KFC on Buckshaw noted as a recent example.

Access to green space and community facilities

57. As with other sections, the importance of good quality, accessible green space and leisure facilities was identified as being important for improving health and well-being. There is concern that recent developments in Chorley and South Ribble have resulted in a loss of green space. More green space/community space was requested around Preston, focusing on the most deprived areas first and all future development across Central Lancashire should offer more opportunities within their developments.
58. Access to employment and good quality green space was also identified as being essential to improving mental health and should be something the plan seeks to address. There were suggestions received to use the River Ribble and Preston docks better to offer more opportunities locally and create a tourist destination, it was felt that the value of the river was underrated and more should be made of this asset. The Cuerden strategic site was noted as an area which presents an opportunity for new healthy community resources.
59. There was concern that existing cultural buildings were not utilised in Preston, and it needs a concert Hall/venue again. The city Centre needs to capitalise its heritage more and provide facilities which promote this, also suggestions for more meeting spaces and galleries which could make use of empty retail units.
60. The quality of social housing was also raised as needing to be provided at a high standard and at an affordable price. Additional community facilities are identified as being required and are not necessarily linked to delivery of new developments, but an existing lack of provision, especially in more rural areas.
61. This section also looked at support for cooperatives as a means of supporting health and wellbeing. It was recognised that cooperatives and SME's provide positive benefits to communities and can help deal with issues of social isolation. Preston Model Flagged as a good example in relation to working with SME's and the community.

Section 6: Climate Change and Resource Management

62. There were 10 questions in this section looking at issues of climate change, waste management and sustainability, air quality, natural assets, design, and the built environment.

Impacts of climate change

63. On climate change, it was noted that this issue is wider reaching than the Plan itself and we will need to work closely with relevant bodies and neighbouring areas to achieve benefits in this area. Suggestions were made around how to prevent this getting worse, including avoiding developing in areas of flood risk and not allowing further loss of green areas and instead preserving them for their carbon sink value.
64. Areas specifically raising the issues of flooding included Whittle-le-Woods (developments near Lucas Green and St Lawrence Green noted as raising issues) with concerns over levels in the River Lostock cited. Significant concern also raised over developments is Croston, Eccleston and Adlington, with the potential for developments in the latter to impact drastically on Croston which has history of severe flooding.

Ground water protection

65. UU noted concerns regarding any sizeable development within the Groundwater Protection Zones of the Fylde Aquifer which provides drinking water for Preston, Fylde and the Blackpool Coast and have suggested specific policies needed to address this and wider surface water management.

Tree planting and air quality

66. There is support for increased tree planting across the plan area, particularly alongside roadsides. There were suggestions that the plan should also require a percentage of land in new developments to be set aside for tree planting and biodiversity net gain. Around Preston particularly, it was noted that more evergreen trees are needed as most have lost their leaves in winter months and therefore are not providing any benefits in absorbing pollutants.
67. Questions on waste management focused on how bins should be provided for new development and was requested by Preston waste management officers. The general feeling is this is not for the Local plan to prescribe, but if developers are asked to pay for this, they will recoup the costs from buyers, therefore there is no benefit. The findings will be passed on to that team for consideration.
68. There is support for greater control on wood burners and the fuels sold to minimise pollution from this source. On general air quality, it was noted that there is a need to reduce development overall and provide better public transport links / sustainable travel option to reduce car usage. Residents across all 3 authorities raised concern about localised air quality and the need for the plan to address this.
69. Pedestrian only zones were suggested in Preston to improve air quality in the City Centre as well as improving pedestrian and cycle routes into the centre and other shopping areas/ towards the hospital. Green infrastructure should be used to reduce pollution, with air quality assessments being required for all developments.

Green technologies

70. The need for carbon neutral homes and renewable energy generation was also promoted. There are also cross cutting themes identified here again around the design of areas to reduce travel by car and thus reduce CO2 emissions.

Design of development - Heritage

71. It is clear that good design is identified as being needed to address a number of factors. Good design must be considered from the outset and address the need to protect and enhance the natural and historic environment. Communities should also be involved in the design of developments for their areas to ensure it is in keeping with local character.
72. A number of the smaller, rural areas noted the need to protect the character of their areas and that any development proposed should be in keeping in both scale and design.

Section 7: Locations for future development

73. This section contained 8 questions, the majority looking at site suggestions and the methodology for assessing sites, with others focusing on the approach to locating new development.
74. The Core Strategy is referenced as the starting point for considering locational requirements, however issues are identified with this, specifically around employment sites and achieving growth aspirations. There is a need for employment and homes to be considered close to one another to ensure sites are accessible and sustainable in the long term and have adequate infrastructure available. North Preston cited a number of times for development area to be considered, as well as brownfield and underused locations in the City Centre
75. There is concern that the plan needs to provide more jobs, not just homes, to prevent areas becoming commuter towns, with better opportunities in the City and town Centres requested for both employment and living.
76. A number of comments were made around the SHELAA methodology and the need for this to accord with NPPF, the suggestions made have been addressed in an addendum to the SHELAA and sites will be assessed accordingly.

Site suggestions

77. Significant comments were made around the site suggestions. Annex 1 detailed site suggestions for Chorley which were considered more acceptable, Annex 5 which detailing all sites which had been put forward in Chorley. The existing safeguarded sites in Whittle-le-Woods BNE3.10 and the Heath Charnock/Rivington site BNE3.4 –received the significant comments objecting to their allocation.
78. Annex 3 detailed site suggestions for Preston, and the sites which received comments were mainly in Preston Rural East and Rural North.
79. Annex 4 detailed site suggestions for South Ribble, with site suggestions in Samlesbury being of concern as well as the existing proposed development at Pickering's Farm for which a separate petition was generated.

80. A detailed record by site of number of responses received is provided at appendix 1.

Protection of Breen Belt/Open Space and Infrastructure provision

81. There is support for preserving the Green Belt and areas of open space across Central Lancashire. Comments from all 3 areas supported protecting green areas and open space from development, as well as maintaining the existing character of areas. There is concern that infrastructure needs are not being met and new development will exacerbate this. There is also concern that what is being built does not meet the needs of the local area and is more to do with profitability for the developers.
82. In contrast, the developers have noted the need for improvements and recognise the positive role new developments can have in improving the situation, and state that new development on the edge of existing settlements is important to ensure future viability of the businesses schools in those areas.

Safeguarded land

83. This question related specifically to the existing safeguarded land policy for Chorley. 75% of those who responded were in favour of keeping this, including developers. However, it is clear the reasons behind both differ. Residents see this as a further level of protection from development, whereas developers see this as providing areas to consider for future investment and development.

Any other comments

84. The last question was a capture all. This picked up issues that had been raised earlier, as well as both positive and negative comments regarding the way the consultation had been carried out which we will need to consider when planning future engagement.

Youth Questionnaire

85. The youth questionnaire which ran alongside the main consultation contained 19 questions, asking views about the area in which respondents live, what interests them and whether facilities in their area meet their needs. It also asked for their views on education and training and work opportunities and thoughts on climate change.
86. Those that responded felt they lived in a nice area, but they did not feel safe travelling by themselves due to poorly lit/maintained cycle and pathways and a lack of dedicated cycle lanes. There was also concern about antisocial behaviour and the impact that has on areas. There were also comments about the general appearance of areas needing improvement.
87. On education, responses stated they do not plan to stay in the area for further education as the options locally do not meet their needs. There is interest in apprenticeships, but there still seems to be concern around this route.

88. 11-21 year olds want to see more green spaces, offering activities for them to engage with like skate parks, climbing walls, sports facilities etc. They also want to see less cars on the road.

Conclusions and next Steps

89. The consultations generated a good level of response from a broad range of stakeholders The analysis of the responses is being used to help formulate policy development for the next phase of the Local Plan and in assessing the suitability of sites for consideration as potential allocations. The comments themselves are not specifically responded to through this Outcomes Report. This stage of plan making is an evidence gathering stage and we are using the information provided to help develop policies and will all be used to help shape the plan itself.
90. The responses have highlighted a need to review some pieces of evidence base, all of which had been planned into the programme, these include:
- The SFRA – this was not available for I&O's, but was noted as needed
 - The Icen housing study – this was to be updated following changes to standard method and to incorporate economic needs
 - Housing needs study – this is in commissioning by Preston
 - SA of the local plan – this will be done for the Preferred Options
 - Local Nature Recovery Strategy – this is something which has been discussed across the Lancashire Authorities, decision on how this will be provided have not yet been identified.
91. The youth questionnaire provided an insight into the concerns of those this plan could affect the most and showed an interest and willingness to engage in planning. This is something which is a real positive from this exercise and which we intend to build on as we develop the plan.
92. Once approved we intend to upload the Outcomes reports onto the website and send a newsletter to all stakeholders updating them on the progress of the plan and how they can access the analysis from the Issues and options work. For the youth questionnaire, we also intend to write directly to all the schools who responded and thank them for their involvements and encourage them to continue with this.
93. We will also write to those that did not engage, sharing with them the findings and inviting them to engage with us in the future. There was also a request to set up a youth council and this is something we will explore further.

Contact for Further Information:

Carolyn Williams 01257 515151

Central Lancashire Local Plan Team

Appendix 1 – Site Response Data for Questions 64, 65 and 67.

Please note sites with an “x” at the end relate to sites in Chorley only and are sites which were included in “Annex 1 – Site Suggestions Proposed by Chorley Council”.

Sites with a “p” at the end of the number relate to site suggestions received for land for protection from development. 57 sites were noted for protection, and the support received for these has been noted.

40 submissions were received for protection in Chorley and broken down by wards as follows: 18 in Euxton North, 11 in Euxton South, 6 in Astley and Buckshaw, 2 in Lostock, 1 in Clayton-le-woods North, 1 in Clayton-le-Woods and Whittle-le-Woods and 1 in Pennine.

9 sites were received for protection in Preston and broken down by ward as follows: 1 in Cadley, 4 in Preston Rural East and 4 in Preston Rural North.

8 submissions were received for protection in South Ribble, 2 in Longton and Hutton, in Bamber Bridge, 2 in Charnock and 3 in Farington West.

I. Number of Annex 1 Site Responses in Question 64 by SHELAA Reference:

SHELAA Ref	Responses	SHELAA Ref	Responses	SHELAA Ref	Q64 Mentions	SHELAA Ref	Responses
19C227x	21	19C243x	5	19C260x	89	19C277x	85
19C228x	15	19C244x	7	19C262x	15	19C278x	69
19C229x	24	19C245x	5	19C263x	10	19C279x	105
19C230x	4	19C246x	2	19C264x	5	19C280x	101
19C231x	0	19C247x	2	19C265x	5	19C281x	129
19C232x	13	19C248x	2	19C266x	2	19C282x	3
19C233x	49	19C249x	2	19C267x	3	19C283x	8
19C234x	68	19C250x	3	19C268x	3	19C284x	5
19C235x	75	19C251x	4	19C269x	2		
19C236x	0	19C252x	0	19C270x	2		
19C237x	0	19C253x	2	19C271x	159		
19C238x	4	19C254x	6	19C272x	102		
19C239x	0	19C255x	1	19C273x	2		
19C240x	0	19C256x	6	19C274x	15		
19C241x	5	19C257x	1	19C275x	15		
19C242x	5	19C259x	93	19C276x	17		

II. Number of Annex 5 Responses in Question 65 by Call for Sites and SHELAA Reference:

CFS Ref	SHELAA Ref	Responses	CFS Ref	SHELAA Ref	Responses
CLCFS00014a	19C001	8	CLCFS00290a	19C087	39
CLCFS00018a	19C002	12	CLCFS00291a	19C088	0
CLCFS00022a	19C003	12	CLCFS00292a	19C089	32
CLCFS00025a	19C004	2	CLCFS00293a	19C090	20
CLCFS00027a	19C005	5	CLCFS00294a	19C091	0
CLCFS00028a	19C006	4	CLCFS00295a	19C092	1
CLCFS00036a	19C007	13	CLCFS00296a	19C093	2
CLCFS00039a	19C008	0	CLCFS00297a	19C094	0
CLCFS00050a	19C009	0	CLCFS00298a	19C095	15
CLCFS00055a	19C010	8	CLCFS00302a	19C096	6
CLCFS00070a	19C012	0	CLCFS00304a	19C097	2
CLCFS00071a	19C013	2	CLCFS00309a	19C098	5
CLCFS00075a	19C014	1	CLCFS00310a	19C099	2
CLCFS00076a	19C015	2	CLCFS00311a	19C100	5
CLCFS00077a	19C016	0	CLCFS00313a	19C101	5
CLCFS00078a	19C017	0	CLCFS00315a	19C102	1
CLCFS00080a	19C018	0	CLCFS00317a	19C103	13
CLCFS00081a	19C019	0	CLCFS00324a	19C104	2
CLCFS00082a	19C020	1	CLCFS00330a	19C105	6
CLCFS00084a	19C021	2	CLCFS00334a	19C106	32
CLCFS00085a	19C022	5	CLCFS00335a	19C107	3
CLCFS00087a	19C023	0	CLCFS00336a	19C108	0

CLCFS00088 a	19C024	1	CLCFS00338 a	19C109	6
CLCFS00092 a	19C025p	0	CLCFS00341 a	19C110	4
CLCFS00105 a	19C026	5	CLCFS00348 a	19C111	0
CLCFS00106 a	19C027	8	CLCFS00353 a	19C112	0
CLCFS00107 a	19C028	0	CLCFS00357 a	19C113	4
CLCFS00111 a	19C029	4	CLCFS00369 a	19C114	0
CLCFS00112 a	19C030	29	CLCFS00373 a	19C115	8
CLCFS00113 a	19C031	9	CLCFS00375 a	19C116	0
CLCFS00117 a	19C033	27	CLCFS00377 a	19C117	5
CLCFS00120 a	19C034	6	CLCFS00379 a	19C118	0
CLCFS00121 a	19C035	35	CLCFS00381 a	19C119	3
CLCFS00124 a	19C036	2	CLCFS00385 a	19C120	5
CLCFS00131 a	19C037	9	CLCFS00392 a	19C121	39
CLCFS00132 a	19C038	5	CLCFS00395 a	19C122	6
CLCFS00134 a	19C040	8	CLCFS00396 a	19C123	2
CLCFS00142 a	19C041	2	CLCFS00397 a	19C124	10
CLCFS00148 a	19C042	1	CLCFS00401 a	19C125	0
CLCFS00150 a	19C043	2	CLCFS00404 a	19C126	6
CLCFS00153 a	19C044	3	CLCFS00411 a	19C127	4
CLCFS00162 a	19C045	26	CLCFS00412 a	19C128	0
CLCFS00164 a	19C046	2	CLCFS00413 a	19C129	1
CLCFS00166 a	19C047	0	CLCFS00026 a	19C190p	4
CLCFS00175 a	19C048	3	CLCFS00029 a	19C191p	0
CLCFS00176 a	19C049	0	CLCFS00040 a	19C192p	1
CLCFS00186	19C050	0	CLCFS00041	19C193p	1

a			a		
CLCFS00188 a	19C051	41	CLCFS00042 a	19C194p	0
CLCFS00194 a	19C052	11	CLCFS00043 a	19C195p	0
CLCFS00195 a	19C053	1	CLCFS00044 a	19C196p	1
CLCFS00196 a	19C054	1	CLCFS00045 a	19C197p	0
CLCFS00201 a	19C056	4	CLCFS00046 a	19C198p	0
CLCFS00202 a	19C057	3	CLCFS00047 a	19C199p	0
CLCFS00210 a	19C058	2	CLCFS00052 a	19C201p	0
CLCFS00223 a	19C059	0	CLCFS00053 a	19C202p	0
CLCFS00224 a	19C060	2	CLCFS00054 a	19C203p	0
CLCFS00227 a	19C061	39	CLCFS00060 a	19C204p	0
CLCFS00229 a	19C062	0	CLCFS00065 a	19C205p	0
CLCFS00235 a	19C063	4	CLCFS00066 a	19C206p	0
CLCFS00238 a	19C064	0	CLCFS00067 a	19C207p	0
CLCFS00246 a	19C066	2	CLCFS00068 a	19C208p	0
CLCFS00250 a	19C067	2	CLCFS00069 a	19C209p	0
CLCFS00254 a	19C068	2	CLCFS00103 a	19C210p	0
CLCFS00255 a	19C069	3	CLCFS00108 a	19C211p	0
CLCFS00256 a	19C070	2	CLCFS00126 a	19C212p	0
CLCFS00260 a	19C071	9	CLCFS00128 a	19C213p	0
CLCFS00262 a	19C072	44	CLCFS00141 a	19C214p	0
CLCFS00266 a	19C073	4	CLCFS00143 a	19C215p	0
CLCFS00267 a	19C074	6	CLCFS00144 a	19C216p	0
CLCFS00268 a	19C075	1	CLCFS00147 a	19C217p	1
CLCFS00272 a	19C076	8	CLCFS00212 a	19C218p	0

CLCFS00275 a	19C077	4	CLCFS00214 a	19C219p	0
CLCFS00277 a	19C078	2	CLCFS00215 a	19C220p	1
CLCFS00278 a	19C079	0	CLCFS00218 a	19C221p	0
CLCFS00279 a	19C080	5	CLCFS00219 a	19C222p	0
CLCFS00280 a	19C081	26	CLCFS00264 a	19C223p	0
CLCFS00282 a	19C082	5	CLCFS00269 a	19C224p	0
CLCFS00283 a	19C083	61	CLCFS00347 a	19C225p	0
CLCFS00284 a	19C084	7	CLCFS00408 a	19C226p	0
CLCFS00286 a	19C085	2	CLCFS00095 a	19C385	0
CLCFS00289 a	19C086	1	CLCFS00157 a	19C386	0

III. Number of Annex 3 and 4 Responses to Question 67 by Call for Sites Reference and/or SHELAA Reference (as applicable):

CFS Ref	SHELAA Ref	Responses	CFS Ref	SHELAA Ref	Responses
CLCFS00005a	19P001	1	CLCFS00030a	19S007	3
CLCFS00035a	19P002	2	CLCFS00031a	19S008	11
CLCFS00057a	19P003	3	CLCFS00032a	19S009	24
CLCFS00089a	19P004	5	CLCFS00033a	19S010	28
CLCFS00090a	19P005	4	CLCFS00034a	19S011	23
CLCFS00118a	19P006	4	CLCFS00037a	19S012	27
CLCFS00119a	19P007	0	CLCFS00051a	19S013	0
CLCFS00122a	19P008	1	CLCFS00058a	19S014	24
CLCFS00123a	19P009	6	CLCFS00059a	19S015	12
CLCFS00129a	19P010	0	CLCFS00062a	19S016	0
CLCFS00130a	19P011	0	CLCFS00074a	19S017	15
CLCFS00136a	19P012	0	CLCFS00086a	19S018	23
CLCFS00140a	19P013	0	CLCFS00091a	19S019	35
CLCFS00149a	19P014	0	CLCFS00096a	19S021	15
CLCFS00158a	19P015	1	CLCFS00098a	19S022	6
CLCFS00173a	19P016	0	CLCFS00099a	19S023	8
CLCFS00179a	19P017	4	CLCFS00101a	19S025	5
CLCFS00189a	19P018	2	CLCFS00102a	19S026	4
CLCFS00190a	19P019	2	CLCFS00109a	19S027	4
CLCFS00191a	19P020	0	CLCFS00115a	19S028	21
CLCFS00192a	19P021	0	CLCFS00127a	19S029	1
CLCFS00199a	19P022	2	CLCFS00135a	19S030	34
CLCFS00207a	19P023	0	CLCFS00137a	19S031	14

CLCFS00211a	19P024	0	CLCFS00138a	19S032	20
CLCFS00222a	19P025	2	CLCFS00145a	19S033	15
CLCFS00225a	19P026	1	CLCFS00146a	19S034	23
CLCFS00228a	19P027	0	CLCFS00154a	19S035	13
CLCFS00232a	19P028	1	CLCFS00155a	19S036	15
CLCFS00233a	19P029	1	CLCFS00156a	19S037	5
CLCFS00239a	19P030	3	CLCFS00159a	19S039	3
CLCFS00241a	19P031	5	CLCFS00161a	19S040	0
CLCFS00242a	19P032	1	CLCFS00163a	19S041	4
CLCFS00244a	19P033	1	CLCFS00165a	19S042	0
CLCFS00247a	19P034	1	CLCFS00167a	19S043	5
CLCFS00248a	19P035	0	CLCFS00168a	19S044	0
CLCFS00249a	19P036	1	CLCFS00169a	19S045	18
CLCFS00251a	19P037	2	CLCFS00170a	19S046	19
CLCFS00252a	19P038	1	CLCFS00171a	19S047	10
CLCFS00253a	19P039	0	CLCFS00172a	19S048	18
CLCFS00257a	19P040	2	CLCFS00182a	19S049	22
CLCFS00258a	19P041	1	CLCFS00184a	19S050	17
CLCFS00263a	19P042	5	CLCFS00187a	19S051	0
CLCFS00274a	19P043	0	CLCFS00193a	19S052	3
CLCFS00281a	19P044	2	CLCFS00198a	19S053	6
CLCFS00303a	19P048	2	CLCFS00200a	19S054	13
CLCFS00305a	19P049	0	CLCFS00203a	19S055	13
CLCFS00306a	19P050	0	CLCFS00204a	19S056	30
CLCFS00307a	19P051	0	CLCFS00205a	19S057	35
CLCFS00308a	19P052	2	CLCFS00206a	19S058	7
CLCFS00314a	19P053	2	CLCFS00208a	19S059	3
CLCFS00318a	19P054	0	CLCFS00209a	19S060	8
CLCFS00343a	19P055	0	CLCFS00220a	19S062	6
CLCFS00350a	19P056	2	CLCFS00221a	19S063	0
CLCFS00356a	19P057	4	CLCFS00226a	19S064	15
CLCFS00358a	19P058	3	CLCFS00230a	19S065	1
CLCFS00359a	19P059	5	CLCFS00231a	19S066	1
CLCFS00360a	19P060	2	CLCFS00236a	19S067	11
CLCFS00361a	19P061	4	CLCFS00237a	19S068	10
CLCFS00362a	19P062	9	CLCFS00240a	19S069	11
CLCFS00364a	19P063	0	CLCFS00245a	19S070	18
CLCFS00366a	19P064	3	CLCFS00259a	19S071	15
CLCFS00376a	19P065	0	CLCFS00261a	19S072	7
CLCFS00384a	19P066	3	CLCFS00265a	19S073	25
CLCFS00386a	19P067	2	CLCFS00270a	19S074	9
CLCFS00394a	19P068	0	CLCFS00271a	19S075	2
CLCFS00400a	19P069	1	CLCFS00276a	19S076	12
CLCFS00405a	19P070	1	CLCFS00312a	19S077	11
CLCFS00407a	19P071	0	CLCFS00316a	19S078	7
CLCFS00410a	19P072	0	CLCFS00319a	19S079	6

CLCFS00416a	19P073	0	CLCFS00320a	19S080	1
CLCFS00417a	19P074	1	CLCFS00321a	19S081	2
CLCFS00418a	19P075	0	CLCFS00329a	19S082	2
CLCFS00421a	19P076	1	CLCFS00331a	19S083	2
CLCFS00423a	19P077	0	CLCFS00332a	19S084	4
CLCFS00424a	19P078	0	CLCFS00333a	19S085	1
CLCFS00425a	19P079	0	CLCFS00337a	19S086	3
CLCFS00426a	19P080	0	CLCFS00339a	19S087	5
CLCFS00427a	19P081	1	CLCFS00340a	19S088	2
CLCFS00428a	19P082	3	CLCFS00342a	19S089	6
CLCFS00429a	19P083	1	CLCFS00345a	19S090	7
CLCFS00435b	19P084	0	CLCFS00346a	19S091	14
CLCFS00436b	19P085	0	CLCFS00349a	19S092	1
CLCFS00441b	19P086	0	CLCFS00351a	19S093	6
CLCFS00452b	19P087	3	CLCFS00352a	19S094	3
CLCFS00495b	19P088	0	CLCFS00354a	19S095	20
CLCFS00496b	19P089	0	CLCFS00363a	19S096	1
CLCFS00497b	19P090	0	CLCFS00365a	19S097	8
CLCFS00498b	19P091	0	CLCFS00367a	19S098	11
CLCFS00499b	19P092	0	CLCFS00368a	19S099	12
CLCFS00500b	19P093	0	CLCFS00370a	19S100	2
CLCFS00501b	19P094	0	CLCFS00371a	19S101	8
CLCFS00503b	19P095	1	CLCFS00372a	19S102	0
CLCFS00507b	19P096	1	CLCFS00374a	19S103	12
CLCFS00508b	19P097	2	CLCFS00378a	19S104	3
CLCFS00509b	19P098	0	CLCFS00380a	19S105	20
CLCFS00510b	19P099	1	CLCFS00382a	19S106	6
CLCFS00522b	19P100	1	CLCFS00383a	19S107	54
CLCFS00524b	19P101	1	CLCFS00387a	19S108	5
CLCFS00527b	19P102	1	CLCFS00388a	19S109	9
CLCFS00528b	19P103	4	CLCFS00389a	19S110	4
CLCFS00531b	19P104	3	CLCFS00390a	19S111	9
CLCFS00532b	19P105	3	CLCFS00391a	19S112	6
CLCFS00536b	19P106	1	CLCFS00393a	19S113	9
CLCFS00537b	19P107	1	CLCFS00398a	19S114	21
CLCFS00538b	19P108	1	CLCFS00399a	19S115	19
CLCFS00539b	19P109	1	CLCFS00403a	19S116	5
CLCFS00540b	19P110	0	CLCFS00406a	19S117	15
CLCFS00541b	19P111	0	CLCFS00409a	19S118	7
CLCFS00542b	19P112	0	CLCFS00414a	19S119	15
CLCFS00543b	19P113	0	CLCFS00415a	19S120	2
CLCFS00544b	19P114	0	CLCFS00419a	19S121	8
CLCFS00549b	19P115	0	CLCFS00420a	19S122	2
CLCFS00550b	19P116	1	CLCFS00434b	19S123	8
CLCFS00554b	19P117	0	CLCFS00437b	19S124	2
CLCFS00555b	19P118	1	CLCFS00438b	19S125	3

CLCFS00556b	19P119	0	CLCFS00439b	19S126	5
CLCFS00557b	19P120	1	CLCFS00440b	19S127	17
CLCFS00559b	19P121	1	CLCFS00455b	19S128	3
CLCFS00562b	19P122	1	CLCFS00458b	19S129	5
CLCFS00563b	19P123	3	CLCFS00459b	19S130	3
CLCFS00564b	19P124	1	CLCFS00463b	19S131	1
CLCFS00565b	19P125	1	CLCFS00464b	19S132	0
CLCFS00566b	19P126	1	CLCFS00473b	19S133	19
CLCFS00569b	19P127	1	CLCFS00476b	19S134	8
CLCFS00572b	19P128	0	CLCFS00478b	19S135	3
	19P130	2	CLCFS00480b	19S136	4
	19P131	0	CLCFS00481b	19S137	0
	19P132	1	CLCFS00485b	19S138	3
	19P133	1	CLCFS00486b	19S139	3
	19P134	0	CLCFS00487b	19S140	4
	19P135	2	CLCFS00488b	19S141	3
	19P136	0	CLCFS00492b	19S142	13
	19P137	0	CLCFS00502b	19S143	41
	19P138	1	CLCFS00505b	19S144	9
	19P139	0	CLCFS00506b	19S145	3
	19P140	0	CLCFS00511b	19S146	0
	19P141	1	CLCFS00512b	19S147	0
	19P142	2	CLCFS00515b	19S148	12
	19P144	3	CLCFS00523b	19S149	11
	19P145	0	CLCFS00525b	19S150	3
	19P146	0	CLCFS00535b	19S151	12
	19P149	0	CLCFS00546b	19S152	4
	19P150	0	CLCFS00547b	19S153	9
	19P151	0	CLCFS00551b	19S154	4
	19P152	0	CLCFS00553b	19S155	19
	19P154	0	CLCFS00570b	19S156	1
	19P155	0	CLCFS00433b	19S157	2
	19P156	1	CLCFS00285a	19S158	5
	19P161	0	CLCFS00287a	19S159	5
	19P162	0	CLCFS00288a	19S160	5
	19P163	0		19S161	4
	19P164	0		19S162	0
	19P165	0		19S163	4
	19P166	0		19S164	2
	19P167	0		19S165	2
	19P168	0		19S166	1
	19P169	0		19S167	5
	19P170	0		19S168	0
	19P171	2		19S169	1
	19P174	1		19S170	0
	19P178	0		19S171	1

	19P184	0		19S172	0
	19P185	0		19S173	1
	19P186	0		19S174	0
	19P187	0		19S175	0
	19P188	0		19S176	3
	19P189	0		19S177	1
	19P190	0		19S178	18
	19P191	0		19S179	0
	19P192	0		19S180	2
	19P193	0		19S181	1
	19P194	0		19S182	0
	19P195	1		19S183	3
	19P196	0		19S184	2
	19P197	0		19S185	3
	19P198	0		19S186	3
	19P199	0		19S187	7
	19P200	0		19S188	7
	19P201	2		19S189	1
	19P202	0		19S190	1
	19P203	0		19S191	1
	19P204	0		19S192	1
	19P205	0		19S193	1
	19P206	0		19S194	1
	19P207	0		19S195	9
	19P208	0		19S196	2
	19P209	0		19S197	1
	19P210	0		19S198	1
	19P211	0		19S199	1
	19P212	0		19S200	4
	19P213	0		19S201	1
	19P215	0		19S202	0
	19P216	0		19S203	1
	19P218	0		19S204	0
	19P219	1		19S205	0
	19P220	1		19S206	0
	19P221	0		19S207	0
	19P222	1		19S208	2
	19P223	1		19S209	10
	19P224	1		19S210	0
	19P225	0		19S211	1
	19P226	0		19S212	14
	19P227	0		19S213	2
	19P228	0		19S214	0
	19P229	2		19S215	1
	19P230	1		19S216	1
	19P231	0		19S217	4

	19P232	0		19S218	5
	19P233	0		19S219	16
	19P234	0		19S220	3
	19P236	1		19S221	3
	19P237	0		19S222	0
	19P238	0		19S223	1
	19P239	0		19S224	1
	19P240	1		19S225	0
	19P241	1		19S226	0
	19P243	0		19S227	0
	19P244	0		19S228	0
	19P245	1		19S229	8
CLCFS00561b	19P246	0		19S230	3
	19P247	1		19S231	9
	19P248	0		19S232	10
	19P249	0		19S233	8
	19P250	0		19S234	6
	19P251	0		19S235	12
	19P252	0		19S236	13
	19P253	1		19S237	15
	19P254	1		19S239	1
	19P255	1		19S240	0
	19P256	1		19S241	0
CLCFS00518b	19P257p	1		19S242	9
CLCFS00519b	19P258p	2		19S243	1
CLCFS00520b	19P259p	0		19S244	2
CLCFS00521b	19P260p	0		19S245	2
CLCFS00526b	19P261p	1		19S246	0
CLCFS00529b	19P262p	1		19S247	2
CLCFS00530b	19P263p	1		19S248	3
CLCFS00545b	19P264p	1		19S249	10
	19P265	1		19S250	17
	19P266	0	CLCFS00125a	19S251p	59
CLCFS00006a	19S001	5	CLCFS00217a	19S252p	0
CLCFS00008a	19S002	14	CLCFS00482b	19S253p	10
CLCFS00011a	19S003	35	CLCFS00517b	19S254p	15
CLCFS00020a	19S004	25	CLCFS00567b	19S255p	17
CLCFS00023a	19S005	17	CLCFS00568b	19S256p	14
CLCFS00024a	19S006	27			

IV. Number of Site Responses by Electoral Ward across Questions 64, 65 and 67:

Ward	Responses	Ward	Responses
Lostock	777	Euxton South	17
Clayton-le-Woods and Whittle-le-Woods	632	Chorley South West	11

Coupe Green and Gregson Lane	519	Bamber Bridge East	11
Samlesbury and Walton	487	Moss Side	11
New Longton and Hutton East	315	Garrison	11
Wheelton and Withnell	268	Greyfriars	9
Eccleston and Mawdesley	246	Chorley North West	9
Brindle and Hoghton	236	City Centre	8
Farington West	226	Howick and Priory	8
Longton and Hutton West	199	Buckshaw and Worden	8
Adlington and Anderton	193	Lea and Larches	7
Pennine	184	Walton-le-Dale East	7
Hoole	173	Lostock Hall	6
Heath Charnock and Rivington	151	Ribbleton	5
Clayton-le-Woods West and Cuerden	82	Clayton-le-Woods North	4
Chorley North East	78	Bamber Bridge West	3
Preston Rural North	64	Ashton	3
Preston Rural East	55	Deepdale	2
Charnock	52	Broadfield	1
Chorley East	40	Broad Oak	1
Ingol and Cottam	36	Sharoe Green	1
Coppull	34	Plungington	1
Astley and Buckshaw	33	Middleforth	1
Walton-le-Dale West	28	Leyland Central	0
Seven Stars	24	Charnock/Middleforth	0
Earnshaw Bridge	21	Cadley	0
Chisnall	21	Brookfield	0
Euxton North	21	Fishwick and Frenchwood	0
Farington East	19	St Matthew's	0
Total			5359