

Pendle Core Strategy Plan Examination

Barrowford Parish Council hearing statement for:

Session 5

Submitted: 20th March 2015

Matter – How is the Housing requirement to be met?

1. Is Policy LIV1 effective in indicating how the housing requirement will be met, including the contribution that will be made from new allocations and existing commitments? See in particular C/004 for Council's response and the suggested Modification below.

- BPC welcomes the suggested additions including the table LIV1 which quantifies the housing numbers.

Table LIV1

Pendle Housing Requirement 2011 to 2030			
A	Overall housing requirement (2011-2030)	(298 x 19)	5,662
B	Completions (2011/12-2013/14)	(From AMR)	154
C	Reduction of empty homes (net) (2011/12-2013/14)		748
D	Residual requirement		4,760
E	Strategic Housing Site Allocation		500
F	Existing commitments (permissions)	(From AMR)	908
G	Allowance for the reduction of empty homes (2015-2030)		0*
H	Remaining requirement to be met through housing site allocations		3,352

*The Empty Homes Strategy and Action Plan show the Council's commitment to reducing the number of empty homes in the borough. It is anticipated that the reoccupation of empty homes will continue to contribute to meeting the housing requirement over the plan period. However, no specific allowance has been made at the present time for a further reduction in the number of empty homes as the evidence to support such a figure is currently being updated. The AMR will monitor progress and provide an adjustment to the housing requirement as necessary.

2. What contribution will be made to the housing requirement from bringing back empty homes into use?

- BPC considers there to be sufficient information in policy LIV1
- Could a % be stated for the amount of empty homes which could come forward?

3. Is there sufficient emphasis on the contribution that can be made from Housing Regeneration Priority Areas?

- Given that there are 5 HRPAs it would be useful to see more

information within the CS on them and what documents are associated with them. These 5 areas are important to keep momentum and developer interest given that they are all mainly previously developed land which the borough would want to see developed first.

- Could something be referenced within the text of policy LIV1 and an additional page be placed in the appendix perhaps 1 page for HRPD detailing the boundary, adopted SPD'S, AAP's and current and projected delivery?

4. Is the proposed strategic housing site at Trough Laithe justified (Policy LIV2)? Does it fit with the settlement hierarchy of the Plan (Barrowford is defined as a Local Service Centre)? Should the site form part of the CS or should consideration be deferred to the SAP?

- BPC are not opposed to the principle of development of the Trough Laithe site, but it is the detailing of issues such as highways and accessibility and the overall projected numbers of the site which give concern
- Barrowford has been classed as a 'local service centre', but the definition does not reflect the fact that within Barrowford the CS puts forward the only strategic housing site (Policy LIV2 – Trough Laithe) which falls more within the definition of a key service centre '*focus for future growth in the borough'.....rather than 'accommodate levels of new development to serve a localised catchment'*.
- BPC are happy with the site to remain in CS but further work on the detail on the future development of the site needs to be carefully considered. PBC need to be clear where this detailed policy will be put forward?

5. Is the Trough Laithe site deliverable in the early years of the Plan period? Is Policy LIV2 sufficiently clear on how and what will be delivered (500 units)? Are there any significant constraints such as historic heritage and access which may prevent the site coming forward? Is the site capable of being readily accessible by public transport, walking and cycling? Should there be a requirement for a development brief for the site? (it is noted that CD/04/04 refers to a development framework produced by the developer)

- It is essential that a development brief be produced for the site, and that this should not simply be left to the responsibility of the potential developer. It is not clear what approach PBC is taking, will

detail be addressed within a policy within the Site Allocations or Development Management Policy? Issues such as phasing, design code, connectivity through the site and landscaping need to be considered in a holistic approach

- Significant constraints on the site are unknown to BPC, has PBC carried out any preliminary enquiries on site with agencies such as LCC Highways, United Utilities, Environment Agency, LCC Archaeology and Ecology?
- The site is capable of being accessible by public transport, walking and cycling but this needs to be addressed in the development brief/masterplan.

6. Should Policy LIV2 reflect the indication in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (Appendix A) that Junction 13 of the M65 would need to be improved by developer contributions?

- Yes, developer contributions should be sought for junction 13
- Would be useful to understand if any feasibility studies have been carried out by LCC highways and the Highways Agency, for any junction improvement, to give an idea of what can be done and potential costs. This should be considered before any potential development comes forward for Trough Laithe.

7. Does Policy LIV2 (OR policy SUP3) need to address any capacity issues in local schools?

- The word education provision needs to be included within the body of the policy text, BPC suggest a further bullet be added for education provision and health
- BPC are aware that both primary schools are at capacity and therefore the potential creation of 500 homes would create obvious pressures to existing primary education provision
- Secondary education also needs to be considered, what do LCC education have to say on the strategic site and the potential implications for primary and secondary education provision? Has PBC reviewed LCC's document ' Strategy for the provision of school places and schools capital investment 2015/16 to 2017/18?

8. Is the affordable housing target of 20% for Trough Laithe justified?

- Yes this is justified but BPC would like to see the policy wording changed to ' the development will provide a minimum of 20%.....' Just stating 'up to 20%' is not robust enough. There is a need to provide new affordable homes within the parish

9. Would an alternative approach to the identification of a single strategic housing site e.g. the allocation of a range of smaller greenfield/brownfield sites, be more effective in boosting the supply of housing?

- Whilst not opposed to the principle of development on the Trough Laithe site, BPC considers there is a danger in concentrating a high percentage of new homes in one place. BPC would welcome a more balanced approach to smaller sites being allocated across the borough.
- There is a danger that Barrowford will reach saturation point, and prevent other settlements within the borough from growing and developing

10. Has the Plan demonstrated through a housing implementation strategy how delivery of a full range of housing will be maintained over the Plan period, including a continuous five year supply of deliverable housing sites? See in particular C/004 for Council's response.

- In particular to the Trough Laithe site, PBC wishes to see a range of type and tenure across the site. Whilst this approach is detailed in policy LIV5 – 'designing better places to live', it is felt that this policy needs better linkages with LIV2. Suggest that an additional box be placed in the Monitoring and Delivery tables of each of the policies which clearly shows what other policies should be referred to

11. Will the Plan be able to ensure a five year housing supply at the point of adoption, taking into account the need to make up any shortfall in provision from the start of the Plan period and the application of a buffer as required by paragraph 47 of the Framework?

- No comment

12. Is a five year supply likely to be deliverable given the reliance on sites without planning permission and with policy constraints?

- The main reliance on the Trough Laithe site and the number of houses needed within the five years seems to be the main driving force for the adoption of the site as the only Strategic Housing Site within the CS and the main driving force the proposed number of houses.
- As Barrowford is only a Local Service Centre, developments of a scale greater than for immediate local use should be sought within Key Service Centres.
- If delivery is not possible early on in the plans period (due to possible site constraints) then what are the next options? What sites are available and which have planning permission in the Key Service Centres?

13. Is the requirement within Policy LIV1 for applicants to demonstrate deliverability necessary?

- Yes, and this should be secured through the development brief/masterplan and tied up with legal agreements.