First name Harry

· Last name Devonport

· Your address [redacted]

· Telephone number [redacted]

· Email address [redacted]

· Preferred contact method Email

· Is an agent representing you No

Page: Local Plan Legal Compliance

· Do you consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant Yes

Page: Local plan Soundness

· Do you consider the Local Plan to be sound No

· Why do you believe the Local Plan is unsound A) It is not positively prepared

· Why do you feel that the Local Plan is unsound limited consultation with sport partners re playing fields

· What changes do you consider necessary, in order to make the Local Plan sound Greater consideration of the playing fields usage and also more focus on ensuring S106 requirements are met

· Have you raised this matter(s) at an earlier stage in the preparation of the Local Plan Yes

Page: Local plan additional comments

· Please provide any additional comments in support of your representation COMMENTS RE PENDLE LOCAL PLAN – FOURTH ADDITION (THE LOCAL PLAN) I would like to ask that the following comments are included within the consultation in response to the above documents. 1. Appendix 6 P001 –P093 PO83 Land south of Grenfell Gardens. I have been a member of the BRPFRG (Barrowford Road Playing Fields Resident Group) for the past few years and we have worked hard with local user groups to ensure the playing fields are well used. The main obstacle to this has been the College's reluctance to maintain the pitches to a standard required and this has only been achieved by the BRPFRG putting pressure on the Council to ensure the College meets the requirements of the S106 agreement which has been in place since the College signed its agreement with the developers. I therefore feel both angry and frustrated that the work of our group has not been acknowledged, indeed ignored and feel that the College is not playing fair in now saying they can no longer afford to maintain the playing fields moving forward. The land in question (along with site P111) we established via the Colne Neighbourhood Plan as a Protected Sport and Recreation Facility, under Policy CNDP10 (CNDP10/8). PO83 contains one of the Youth 9v9 Football Pitches and P111 contains the other two 9v9 pitches. The summary assessment, therefore, makes no mention of the regular use of this site for youth football, matches and training, in the same manner as site P111. The attendant difficulties to develop this land are therefore the same as for P111. It should also be noted, in the section about restricted covenants, that both PO83 and P111 are subject to an S106 agreement (see details below). 2. Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy and Action

Plan Page 59 Sports Strategy and Action Plan Site ID1 Barrowford Road Playing Fields There are THREE pitches not TWO. Nelson and Colne College signed up an S106 Agreement which sets out clear obligations on the College regarding maintenance, which they continue to attempt to renege on. In fact, maintenance of the pitches only started when the BRPFRG met with the Council to discuss the need to require the College to reinstate the maintenance schedule post Covid so that the pitches could be used by local groups. This was initially done but of late has become very hit and miss with the College only maintaining two of the three pitches meaning the third area is unusable. I find the comments in Page 1 of 2 V1.0 above document regarding "costing more to maintain than gaining in income" has been true since the day the S106 was signed (17 Sep 2010), as junior pitches are free to use in Pendle. The College is a business and would have been clear on its obligations when in entered into the agreement and would have build it contingency for the years to come into its business plan. The S106 was an obligation agreed by the College to enable the developer to receive planning permission for over 30 new executive houses on Grenfell Gardens as well as permission to convert the old college building into apartments. Nothing has changed over that time. At the time of the agreement no sports land or pitches were reduced in the development process. Therefore, the College would have taken into account the ongoing costs of the S106 obligations against the sales proceeds they received for the land and buildings. I find it unacceptable that the College, having financially gained significantly from the development deal should now feel it no longer needs to honour an agreement to maintain playing field space for local people and is looking to potentially gain more financially with development of the playing fields as housing to the detriment of local user groups. I do worry that if this is allowed that S106 agreements in future will have limited value in the eyes of other developers. The College gained financially at the time of the agreement and should divert some of the finance into meeting the requirements of the S106 agreement. The College by its actions is creating a situation where they can say the playing fields are not well used by failing to carry out proper maintenance. As stated above, Pitch 3 has for some time not been maintained and we understand that the College has instructed the Council Parks Department not to maintain Pitch 3 (Site P083 in appendix 6 Site Analysis). The BRPFRG lobbied the Council to ensure that this pitch s also maintained and subsequently maintenance has been reinstated. More recently the College has adopted of doing the bare minimum required by the agreement and has now instructed the Council Parks Department to stop grass cutting between Barrowford Road and the pitches. This means that the pitches are now becoming unplayable as the area not being cut is one of the key drainage areas for the pitches and this is causing pitch deterioration by restricting the drainage. Despite requests for this wider area to be maintained, the College have refused to withdraw this instruction. The Barrowford Road Playing Fields Residents Group has demonstrated our willingness to work with the College and the Council to maximise use of the playing fields for sports but the College have refused to engage. Over the past few years, we have sponsored local teams and increased the usage of the pitches. I do not feel it is fair to say in the consultation report that the pitches are poor quality full stop, when the condition of the pitches could be much improved simply by the Council enforcing the Covenants in the S106 on the College, which could eradicate the shortfall of 9 x 9 football pitches identified in Table 1.2. This is a situation the College has allowed to happen. In terms of recommended actions, I feel before there is any discussion of potential options for the land on which the playing fields sit, there should be a priority for the 'Council to work with the College to ensure maintenance of the pitches is in line with the S106 obligations as per the first schedule dated 17 Sep 2010'

· Do you wish to participate at the hearing sessions No

- How did you find out about this consultation Email