

I support the aspects of the Pendle Local Plan which prioritise development on brownfield and urban sites.

It seems to me that these sites would be most likely to be able to provide the needed affordable housing and to also remain environmentally sustainable, allowing people to best access public transport systems.

I support the aspects of the Plan which retain greenbelt protections, and as part of this would like to see the levy on greenfield development applied.

This connects with my concern that Pendle must robustly protect its priority habitats and species. There are a number of sites, such as the Upper Rough, which support threatened species - as we have a biodiversity crisis, it is vital that the conservation of nature is not viewed as a secondary issue in planning decisions.

It is important to me that green gaps between settlements are maintained, to prevent urban sprawl and continuous ribbon developments. This is important for a sense of community, visual aspects, but also for threatened species such as the hedgehog which needs uninterrupted terrain to survive.

New builds should also have stipulations such as fence gaps, wildlife highways, swallow bricks, etc, to help balance competing needs of nature and house building.

Biodiversity net gain should not be a tick box exercise, and I would support aspects of the Plan which ensure meaningful measures, with like for like habitats provided locally.

Finally, I am happy to see that the Upper Rough has a proposed designation as Local Green Space. It is not designated for housing, and has met the 3 tests as provided in the NPPF and so I see no further obstacle. I also see no reason to add further criteria for LGS, when the 3 existing tests are already very robust and difficult to meet.