Preparing a Local Plan for Pendle

Evidence Base



























Strategic Housing Site Allocation

1 Background

- 1.1 Pendle adopted its current Local Plan in May 2006. Following on from that the Council started the preparation of a Core Strategy ("the CS"). The preparation of the CS commenced with an open invitation to the community and developers to discuss prevailing issues that faced Pendle and what approach should be taken to deal with these. This was referred to as the "You Choose" stage of the Plan preparation. It was not part of the statutory Plan preparation framework.
- 1.2 In order to frame the development of the preferred option, an issues and options consultation was undertaken in 2008, in tandem with the Sites Allocation consultation. We were at the same time discussing spatial issues with our neighbouring Councils and other bodies with an interest in Pendle. The consultation in July 2008 included a request for any party with a site that they were interested in developing to put it forward and discuss it with us. Sites were identified as part of that as well as those that were part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment ("the SHLAA").
- 1.3 At the time the housing allocation level was set though the now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West. The requirement in Pendle was to deliver 190 houses per annum. The requirement overall for housing over the Plan period was to deliver 3,375 units, as a minimum.
- 1.4 The results of that consultation, alongside the preparation of the supporting evidence, resulted in the publication of the Preferred Option which was consulted on in September 2011. That was to lead to the Publication version of the CS. There was no proposal to allocate any strategic site for housing or employment within the Preferred Option. No comments had been received from any source leading to the publication of the Preferred Option that there was a need to have a strategic housing site. The SHLAA published at the time showed that there were sufficient sites available to meet the five year supply of housing land as well as to provide for housing over the lifetime of the Plan
- 1.5 Emerging decisions from the Planning Inspectorate and comments received on the Preferred Options consultation led to a decision being made to update some of the evidence base. Of particular relevance was the decision to update the Strategic Housing Market Assessment ("the SHMA") on which the housing numbers in the CS would be based. Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners were appointed to undertake the SHMA.
- 1.6 In accordance with the figures derived from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment the Council is seeking to deliver 298 houses per annum and an overall housing requirement of 5,662 units.

- 1.7 The Council had also received an objection based on the need to allocate a site as a strategic housing site. The objection was that if the site was not delivered the CS could not be delivered.
- 1.8 The SHMA evidence showed that there was a need to provide a greater number of houses to accommodate the housing needs of the Borough over the Plan period. There was also an increase in the amount of under delivery of houses which had to be taken into account in the overall net housing requirement.
- 1.9 It is against this background that the Council needed to consider how to address the provision of houses to meet its objectively assessed needs.

2 Planning Policy

- 2.1 The national and local planning policy base upon which the CS will be assessed has altered significantly since work on the CS commenced. The higher order plan of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West, previously part of the development plan, has been abolished. The suite of Planning Policy Statements that existed were replaced by the National Planning Framework ("the Framework").
- 2.2 The Framework sets out core planning principles that should underpin land use planning. These include having up to date plans in place and these should proactively drive and support economic development to deliver the homes and businesses that the country needs. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Sustainable development has three dimensions to it those of an economic role, a social role and an environmental role.
- 2.3 Paragraph 17 of the Framework sets out 12 core planning principles that are to underpin both plan making and decision-taking. These include the planning system being genuinely plan led and for the system to proactively drive and support sustainable development.
- 2.4 Part 1 of the Framework considers the factors that are needed to build a strong and competitive economy. It states that barriers to investment need to be addressed including poor environment and lack of infrastructure, services or housing. Councils are encouraged to set criteria or identify strategic sites for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period.
- 2.5 Part 6 of the Framework relates to housing. It states that evidence bases should be used so that Plans meet the full objectively assessed need for housing. Key sites that are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period should be identified.

- 2.6 Paragraph 52 states that the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, although what this is defined as is not stated.
- 2.7 Policies for plan making are set out in paragraphs 150 185 inclusive. Local Planning Authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.
- 2.8 Paragraph 155 places an emphasis on meaningful engagement in the production of a Local Plan. This is an important paragraph as it places a responsibility on both Councils, neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses to actively engage in the process. It does not encourage developers to bring issues to the table at the last minute as this does not help to achieve a collective vision but merely brings forward single interest issues which are not necessarily in accordance with then Strategic Vision of the Plan.

Planning Practice Guidance

- 2.9 Local Plans can indicate broad locations for strategic development and allocate designations on a proposals map. They should also allocate sites to promote development.
- 2.10 The Planning Practice Guidance recently published gives practical advice for a range of planning issues including Local Plan preparation. It indicates that both needs and opportunities should be looked at in Local Plan preparation. It indicates that Local Plans should make clear what is intended to happen in the area over the life of the plan, where and when this will occur and how it will be delivered. Giving certainty to development and where and how it will be delivered is a key element of a Local Plan.
- 2.11 In terms of the detail of Local Plans it says they should concentrate on the critical issues facing the area including its development needs and the strategy and opportunities for addressing them, paying careful attention to both deliverability and viability.
- 2.12 The Guidance explains that Plans should be realistic about what can be delivered and when.
- 2.13 The Guidance says that evidence should be proportionate to ensure plans are underpinned by a broad understanding of viability. Greater detail may be necessary in areas of known marginal viability or where the evidence suggests that viability might be an issue – for example in relation to policies for strategic sites which require high infrastructure investment.
- 2.14 In terms of the identification of sites both a desktop approach to identifying sites, including those which may have constraints on them, as well as sites that are put forward by developers need to be considered. Assessments on

the likely build out rates and time for sites to come to the market should be undertaken as part of SHLAAs.

3 Core Strategy, Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives

- 3.1 The Core Strategy has been carefully prepared in conjunction with the community, developers and other public bodies. It has been guided by the Sustainability Appraisal that has tested the development options put forward to ensure that they bring forward a plan that would result in sustainable development.
- 3.2 The vision for the Borough is to create a dynamic area that reacts to the needs of our residents. Important in this is to provide a balanced housing market that will help support other economic activity. This is in the face of the increased need for housing as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the issues of low demand facing the Borough and its neighbour Burnley.
- 3.3 Our fifth strategic objective is to deliver sufficient quality housing to meet the needs of the Borough and to provide a better balance to the housing market which, in turn, is heavily influenced by the number of terraced units the Borough has.
- 3.4 The CS seeks to promote development in a way that is sustainable. Sustainable development is defined, for the purposes of planning, by paragraphs 18 to 219 of the Framework. These need to be taken as a whole in defining sustainable development. The paragraphs individually have components which contribute to what, taken together holistically, results in sustainable development.
- 3.5 Part 4 of the Framework is reflected in terms of local circumstances in policy ENV4 of the CS. This seeks to manage travel demand and to locate new housing development near to employment opportunities.
- 3.6 The Local Plan will be broken into two parts. Part 1 will be the Core Strategy. This will set the strategic direction of the plan and define the overall quantum of development that is needed. It will identify broad locations of development and ensure that the infrastructure that is needed to deliver the Plan is able to be delivered.
- 3.7 Part 2 will be a Site Allocations and Development Policies DPD. This will allocate the majority of sites that will come forward for development, informed by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for housing.
- 3.8 The CS recognises that there has been under delivery set against both the former RSS numbers and the housing target derived from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment ("SHMA") undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield

and Partners. Policy LIV 1 of the Further Options Report recognises that there needs to be early delivery of housing. This recognises that there has been under delivery and also recognises that there has been an increase in projected need identified in the SHMA.

- 3.9 Policy LIV 2 has been specifically included to help address under delivery and respond to the proposed increase in the housing requirement early in the plan period. This is dealt with in more detail in section 4.
- 3.10 The SHMA recognises that there is a need to deliver affordable housing. The amount overall that is needed is 40%. Market conditions need however to be taken into account that will, according to the viability evidence the Council has, mean that a 40% delivery threshold is not likely to be possible under prevailing market conditions. Viability in the M65 corridor is at its highest on the north side of Nelson and Colne in areas such as Barrowford and areas to the north of Laneshawbridge. This places a greater emphasis on these areas being able to deliver housing early in the plan period with viability to the south of the M65 corridor being low until the market improves.

4 Past Delivery

4.1 The economic situation facing the Borough and the country has significantly altered since the Replacement Pendle Local Plan was adopted in 2006. During the period immediately prior to the downturn a significant amount of housing was being delivered in Pendle predominantly on brownfield land. Ironically this resulted in concerns being raised regarding the number of houses being built which in turn resulted in housing schemes being turned down on this point. An example of this is the then Secretary of State refusing permission to erect 206 houses on land at Knotts Lane in Colne based on the oversupply of housing (Ref: APP/E2340/A/02/1098593).



4.2 The graph below shows the delivery of housing over this period.

- 4.3 The delivery of housing was set against a Regional Spatial Strategy target of 190 units per annum. The above graph shows that delivery up to 2008/9 was consistently higher than this and that Pendle had a healthy market for new housing.
- 4.4 This needs to be compared with the position since as shown in the graph below. Gross completions have significantly reduced. This is combined with the residual outfall of the Housing Market Renewal Programme which saw a number of houses demolished resulting in a negative position for two years 2008 2010. Recovery has mirrored the national economy and new build completions are still low.



4.5 The under delivery of housing in the recent past, taken together with the increased need for housing as identified in the SHMA, has led to a requirement to revisit the portfolio of sites in the SHLAA. This is in accordance with paragraph 47 of the Framework. The sites included in this comprised of sites put forward by developers as part of the Local Plan process, sites allocated for housing, land identified as being potentially suitable from a range of other sources (eg sites with lapsed planning consents) as well as sites with planning permission. The SHLAA is the most comprehensive list of housing land that is or may be available for development in the Borough.

5 Definition of Strategic Site

- 5.1 There is no statutory definition of what a strategic site is or how it must be defined. The now revoked Planning Policy Statement 12 had a section in it which said of strategic sites "These should be those sites considered central to achievement of the strategy. Progress on the core strategy should not be held up by inclusion of non-strategic sites." This is not however repeated in current policy or guidance. It is however a succinct way of defining the broad characteristics of what a strategic site should be.
- 5.2 The Planning Advisory Service has offered guidance on what the characteristics of a strategic site should be. This is reproduced below:
 - Is the site critical to the delivery of the spatial strategy for your district or borough? A core strategy should only contain sites that are critical to realising the strategy.

- What is the added value in **defining clear site boundaries** within the core strategy?
- Would you **fail to meet the spatial vision** for the district or borough if the site was not delivered in the plan period?
- Which of your core strategy **spatial objectives** would the site help deliver?
- Is the site required to deliver national, sub regional or regional objectives? For example, strategic housing and/or employment growth identified at a regional level as major urban extensions or 'areas of search'?
- Is it required to **deliver infrastructure** which is central to the delivery of the plan and its objectives? For example, sites that include land for strategic new transport corridors, flood protection measures and meeting the district's carbon targets?
- Can you **demonstrate stakeholder buy-in** and sufficiently robust evidence (sources of funding, timescales for delivery, gaps in funding, contingency) to be reasonably certain that the specific infrastructure requirements of any strategic sites can be delivered?
- 5.3 These characteristics are ones that assist in defining what a strategic site is both in the context of housing and employment. They are used to help define what a strategic housing site would constitute in Pendle. The Local Plan will contain two parts. The first is the Core Strategy that will set out the quantum of development needed to meet the needs of the Borough. It will also define the broad locations of where that need will be met based on an examination of the evidence. Part two will consist of a Development Management and Land Use Allocations Development Plan Document. This will allocate the majority of sites for housing, employment and other uses. The none inclusion of a site in the Core Strategy does not mean that it will not be brought forward for development or that it will not be allocated. The only allocations proposed are those that are critical to the delivery of the Local Plan.

6 Evidence to Support a Strategic Site

- 6.1 The Secretary of State recently considered an appeal at Knotts Lane in Colne Ref: APP/E2340/A/13/219574. This was for a development of 203 houses. That appeal was dismissed based on design grounds with no other issues outweighing that, notwithstanding that the Council had not got at that time a 5 year supply of housing land. The SHLAA has since been updated.
- 6.2 As part of the deliberations on the appeal both the Inspector and the Secretary of State considered the issue of delivery and how a site of that scale could influence the general supply of housing across the Borough. The developer indicated that they would deliver 25 units per annum which could increase if market demand increased.
- 6.3 The conclusion reached was that this rate of delivery would not have an impact on the overall housing provision across the Borough. That is not to say that the site is not one that should be delivered or that it would not contribute to overall supply. The issue raised was that a site of that scale would not affect housing delivery across the Borough to any significant

degree. Delivery of housing and the impact that a site could make to housing provision across the Borough is a significant element in determining if a site fulfills a strategic function. Clearly also of importance is having certainty that a site can be delivered as if it is not then it could not play a strategic role in delivering the Local Plan.

6.4 A range of sites will need to come forward that holistically will deliver the land and housing the Borough needs to provide for the housing the population will require over the lifetime of the Plan. These will range from smaller sites delivering a limited individual quantum of units to larger sites that will deliver more units. The Plan does not seek to rely on a limited number of large sites for delivery but a range of sites of different sizes in different locations.

7 The Sites

- 7.1 Appendix A details all of the sites that are above 100 units which are contained in the SHLAA. The threshold of 100 has been chosen to add robustness to the process. It allows sites which have a relatively small number of units to be considered in a strategic context, whilst excluding smaller sites which due to their size and due to the low amount of housing they could deliver, being excluded from consideration. The matrix assesses each site against the characteristics a Strategic Site should contribute to as set out above. Critically it also assesses sites for their viability. This is assessed against the viability assessment undertaken by Colliers on behalf of the Council. Where individual assessments have been undertaken for planning applications these have also been taken into account. The sites themselves are shown in Appendix B.
- 7.2 It is also important to understand the background to the consideration of sites. The Council has undertaken several consultations asking for sites to be put forward for development as well as considering potential sites independent of developers putting their sites forward. There has been a full process of engaging with owners through the preparation of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. With the exception of Peel Land and Property Holdings, and their site at Trough Laithe, no developer has put forward information to indicate their site is capable of being a strategic site until the publication of the Further Options Core Strategy.
- 7.3 The Council procured Colliers to undertake a viability assessment for several key types of development for the Borough. Those sites which are not viable as assessed against the findings of the Viability Study have been discounted. This is a prudent approach in the economic and housing circumstances that are currently prevalent.
- 7.4 Sites which are currently allocated for housing are also not included as they are existing commitments. These are Gib Hill (385), Land at the end of Knotts Drive (482), James Nelson (NN110/199) and Further Clough Head (203).

- 7.5 The number of units that a site can deliver and the rate that site can deliver those units is an important element in determining if a site would play a strategic role in housing delivery over the Plan period. The overall housing requirement is 5,662 with an annual provision rate of 298. It has already been established by an Appeal determined by the Secretary of State that a site of 200 houses and the delivery of units arising from that is not likely to make significant change to housing delivery on its own. One site of 200 houses would deliver 3.5% of the overall housing requirement. Sites that deliver under 200 units have been discounted from being able to fulfill a strategic function based on the amount of housing they could deliver singularly. Six have been discounted on that basis (S044, S127, S219, S006, NN086 and S199).
- 7.6 The site at Stoney Bank Road (S020) could deliver 208 units. It is situated outside of the M65 corridor in Earby. It is not therefore likely to deliver housing in the short term to assist in the delivery of the Plan. It is also only marginally over the 200 unit threshold which has resulted in other sites being discounted for not providing housing likely to lead to a change in delivery of housing in the Borough.
- 7.7 There are three sites that remain to be considered. Although two of them are separate they are in fact adjacent to each other, are in one ownership and indications are that they would be developed together. These are S012 and S010. Jointly these could deliver360 units, 90 units on S012 and 270 on S010. They are on land known collectively as Windermere Avenue. The number of units takes into account the site constraints that have been identified in discussions with the agent's for a potential development. The sites combined could deliver 6.3% of the overall needs of the Borough.
- 7.9 There is no direct comparison within Pendle of the development of a site of this size and what it is likely to deliver per annum. Planning policy over the last 10 years or so has been framed set against the Regional Spatial Strategy. That had a significantly lower annual provision rate than is now proposed in the Core Strategy. There was also an emphasis on delivery of housing on brownfield land which comprised of a significant proportion of land on which housing was delivered in Pendle.
- 7.10 The recession has hit delivery rates in the Borough. The aspirations of the Plan are to deliver a significant amount of housing above what has been delivered over the last six years. It is also true to say that the improvements of housing delivery in other parts of the country have not been mirrored in Pendle or other parts of East Lancashire, although there are signs of that altering. This means that direct comparison with amounts of housing to be delivered on individual sites cannot be established from local data over the period of the recession.

7.11 Data has been assessed on some of the major house builders to consider what could be achieved from individual sites and the following details average sales reservations per outlet. The three highest volume builders have rates of:

		Weekly	Yearly
Barratt's	2013	0.58	36
	2014	0.69	30.16
Taylor Wimpey	2013	0.67	34.84
	2014	0.71	36.92
Persimmon	2013	0.56	29.12
	2014	0.65	33.8

- 7.12 The maximum company average yearly reservations per outlet is 36.92. Persimmon, who are active in Pendle, have an average of 33.8 for the current year to date. That is above the level that they anticipate for delivering a greenfield site on the south side of Colne which they anticipated being around 20 per annum.
- 7.13 The likely reservation rate for the single outlet at Windermere Avenue, taking account of the prevailing market conditions in Pendle, and national averages would be around 30 per annum. No information has been derived that would conclude that the rate would be beyond that. This would mean that the site could deliver 10% of the annual needs of the Borough.
- 7.14 During the last quarter of 2013 and the first quarter of 2014 negotiations were ongoing with a developer who was seeking to develop the site. This included initial work on the framework for developing the site and preparation of supporting documents. That abruptly ceased in March 2014 and no contact has been made since. This leaves the issue of delivery of the site in doubt in the short term, although the site is one that could be delivered viably.
- 7.15 The site itself will be part of a portfolio of sites which will deliver the housing needs of the Borough. It will not however be critical to the delivery of the Plan at this stage although it is highly likely that it will be an allocation in part 2 of the Plan. The land owner has objected to the Core Strategy based on this site being critical to the Plan's delivery. That has not been supported by information that demonstrates what the site can deliver, how it will be delivered and what infrastructure the site will bring forward.
- 7.16 In overall terms therefore Windermere Avenue will not on its own deliver a quantum of development that is critical to achieving the housing numbers the Plan is proposing. There is a lack of supporting evidence on how the site can be delivered and what infrastructure will be delivered as part of the development.

- 7.17 The Core Strategy seeks to allocate land at Trough Laithe as a Strategic Site Allocation for circa 481 houses. This represents 8.5% of the total housing needs of the Borough or 16.7% of the annual need of the Borough. This is based on the site providing a minimum 50 houses per year against a target of 298 units per annum. This would be over a sustained period of 9.5 years before the site is complete.
- 7.18 The site is located close to the Strategic Employment Site proposed and is in an accessible location within a minute of the M65. It is also in easy reach of the rail network serving Nelson and Colne. From a transport perspective, and from the perspective of accessibility to employment sites, the site is in a sustainable location.
- 7.19 The site owner has provided a development framework which shows how the site can be developed. It provides analysis of the site and its surroundings and what infrastructure it is likely to deliver. The site will also be likely to assist in the delivery of improvements to junction 13 of the M65 which has received funding as part of the Lancashire Growth Deal.
- 7.20 The developer has provided additional information supporting the level of delivery that the site is likely to achieve. It indicates that the site would be likely to achieve a range of 47-54 units per annum with affordable units comprising of around 20% of those. The delivery of affordable housing is important for the Borough as historic delivery rates are low and current market conditions make delivery of units on many sites challenging. This is supported by a number of viability assessments submitted in support of planning applications. For example the 204 unit development on the greenfield land at Colne owned by Persimmon could not deliver any affordable homes.
- 7.21 Importantly the site has a willing develop behind it that is committed to early delivery of the site. This has been in conjunction with a developer partner. This gives confidence that the site will be brought forward early and will not be land banked.

Conclusions

- 8.1 Allocation of a strategic site needs to be critical to the delivery of the Plan and bring forward development early in the Plan period. With under delivery of housing over the period of the recession there is a need to increase delivery early in the plan period. Delivery of infrastructure and affordable housing in the M65 corridor is important early in the Plan period. It is also important that there is as much certainty as possible in the delivery of a Strategic Site.
- 8.2 The analysis of the sites in the SHLAA is that only the Trough Laithe site will deliver the quantum of housing, the infrastructure and affordable housing at an early stage in the Plan. This would be critical to the delivery of the Plan. Other sites will clearly be necessary to achieve the overall delivery of housing over the Plan period but these will be subject of an allocation process in Part 2 of the Plan.

Appendix A

Site	Ref	Number of Units	Current Allocation	PP Granted	Viable	Is the site critical to deliver the Core Strategy?	Demonstrate stakeholder buy-in	Fail to meet the spatial vision	Defining clear site boundaries	Deliver national, regional or sub- regional objectives	Deliver infrastructure	Dismissed
Land off Kelbrook Road	S127	110	Open Countryside	No	Greenfield site east of Salterforth. Site typology identified as viable in the DVS.	The site would deliver housing, but not on a scale that would see a change to overall delivery rates. It is also outside of the M6S Corridor	No	Some housing is needed in Rural Pendle and this would help to fulfil that. Development of the site would not contribute significantly to the overall housing requitrement and is poorly located in relation to the strategic employment site.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure.	Yes
Land east of Colne Road, Field No's. 4700part & 3982	5219	110	Open Countryside	No	Greenfield site south of Earby. Site typology identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	No	Some housing is needed in the West Craven area and this would help to fulfil that. Development of the site would not contribute significantly to the overall housing requitrement and is poorly located in relation to the strategic employment site.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure.	Yes
Land at Stoney Bank Road	S020	208	Open Countryside Conservation Area (part)	No	Greenfield site in Earby. Site typology identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	No	Some housing is needed in the West Craven area and this would help to fulfil that. Development of the site would not contribute significantly to the overall housing requitrement and is poorly located in relation to the strategic employment site.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure	Yes
Lidgett Triangle	S006	100	Open Countryside Protected Area Conservation Area	No	Greenfield site to the north of Colne. Site typology identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	No. There is considerable opposition to the development of this site by local residents.	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is not in an accessible location. The spatial vision seeks not only seeks to deliver the right quality and quantum of housing in sustainable locations that will help to support growth, but also to protect important green spaces. Development of this site, which is wholly within a Conservation Area, would not make a positive contribution to the achievement of these objectives.		The site would help deliver a range of housing and affordable homes in a location that is sustainable. It would also however affect a designated heritage asset to an unacceptable degree	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure except for a limited amount of affordable housing [HOW DO WE KNOW?]	Yes
Lenches Road / Knotts Lane	S161	168	Open Countryside	No		The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	No	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is not in an accessible location. The site is highly visible and would be extremely prominent when viewed from across the valley to the north (Colne Town Centre). The spatial visions seeks to balance the need for growth and the need to protect the landscape.		The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure except for a limited amount of affordable housing	Yes
Former Brierfield wastewater treatment works	\$126	105	Open Countryside	Νο	Greenfield site to the west of Brierfield. Site typology not identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	No	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site is not economically viable and would thus not be able to deliver housing until the economic situation improves	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure	Yes

Little Teacle Fee	C == /01 /00 /2	400	Onen Countraide	No	Constitution		No	The size is signaled in the MCC Consider and the first	Definition sit	The side is not any available of the	These is an evidence to support the	M
Little Tom's Farm	Gen/01/08/2 011/04	468	Open Countryside	NÓ	the east of Brierfield.	The site provides for a quantum of development that would make a significant contribution to the delivery of the overall housing needed. However, the site is not viable and will not deliver any housing in the short term.	NO	The site is situated in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It offers easy access to the employment growth areas the Council is seeking to deliver.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site is not economically viable and would thus not be able to deliver housing until the economic situation improves	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure except for a limited amount of affordable housing	Yes
					Site typology not identified as viable in the DVS.	It is also unlikely to deliver a significant number of units per annum if, or when, it does become viable.		The spatial vision aims to provide a balanced housing market, which in Pendle means delivering a large amount of affordable housing. Poor viability means that the site would be unlikely to deliver any affordable housine.				
Walk Mill, Green Road / Spring Gardens Road	1052	207	Within Settlement Boundary	No	PDL within Colne. Site typology not identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	Yes. The site was earmarked for housing development as part of the South Valley Masterplan, which was included significant public participation. The masterplan was agreed by the utility companies and LCC as Highways Authority.	The site is situated in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth three. It offers easy access to the employment growth areas the Council is seeking to deliver. The spatial vision aims to provide a balanced housing market, which in Pendle means delivering a large amount of affordable housing. Poor viability means that the site would be unlikely to deliver any affordable housing.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site is not economically viable and would thus not be able to deliver housing until the economic situation improves	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure except for a limited amount of affordable housing	Yes
Spring Gardens Mill, Green Road	1053		Within Settlement Boundary	No	PDL within Colne. Site typology not identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	Yes. The site was earmarked for housing development as part of the South Valley Masterplan, which was included significant public participation.	providing housing to support growth there. It offers easy access to the employment growth areas the Council is seeking to deliver. The spatial vision aims to provide a balanced housing market, which in Pendle means delivering a large amount of affordable housing. Poor viability means that the site would be unlikely to deliver any affordable housing.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site is not economically viable and would thus not be able to deliver housing until the economic situation improves	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure except for a limited amount of affordable housing	Yes
Gib Hill	385	216	Within Settlement Boundary HMR Reserved Land for Housing	No	Greenfield site between Nelson and Colne. Site typology not identified as viable in the DVS, but within Council ownership and capable of being bwrought forward.	The site is able to deliver housing on a Greenfield site. The number of units overall and the rate of delivery would not be critical to the overall delivery of the Plan	The site has a housing allocation. That was delivered subsequent to a public inquiry. Stakeholders were involved in that process.	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site sits adjacent to a similar site which is economically viable. The site will help to deliver a range of houses on Council owned and controlled land	site would deliver any infrastructure except for a limited amount of	Yes
Windermere Avenue	S012		Within Settlement Boudary Site of Settlement Character	No	Greenfield site to the east of Colne. Site typology identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will deliver 108 units and will help to deliver housing to meet the overall level the Borough needs. Singularly in itself it will not provide a level that if not provided the Core Strategy could not be delivered	Developer has undertaken stakeholder engagement. There is considerable opposition to the development of this site by local residents.	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure except for a limited amount of affordable housing	Yes
Land between Skipton Old Road and Castle Road	S010		Open Countryside Protected Area Conservation Area (Part)	No	Greenfield site to the east of Colne. Site typology identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will deliver 282 units and will help to deliver housing to meet the overall level the Borough needs. Singularly in itself it will not provide a level that if not provided the Core Strategy could not be delivered	Developer has undertaken stakeholder engagement. There is considerable opposition to the development of this site by local residents.	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location.	boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure except for a limited amount of affordable housing	Yes
Land off Halifax Road	S044	62	Within Settlement Boundary Site of Settlement Character	No	Greenfield site within Brierfield. Site typology not identified as viable in the DVSbut within Council ownership and capable of being bvrought forward.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	No	The site is in the M6S Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location. However, the site is not viable and is unlikely to come forward.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure including affordable housing.	Yes
Land to rear of St. Thomas's Primary School, Wheatley Lane Road	S199	197	Open Countryside	No	Greenfield site to the north of Barrowford. Site typology identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	No	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure except for affordable housing	Yes

Land to rear of St. Thomas's Primary School, Wheatley Lane Road	S199	197	Open Countryside	No	Greenfield site to the north of Barrowford. Site typology identified as viable in the DVS.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	No	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing, Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure except for affordable housing	Yes
Land at Trough Laithe Farm	S124	481	Open Countryside Protected Area	No	Greenfield site to the west-west of Barrowford. Whilst this quantum of housing has not been tested in the DVS, the site is in a location that is generally viable. Peel Land & Property has undertaken a site specific viability assessment confirming its viability.	The site is located in an area that is viable. It will also be able to deliver affordable units. The site can deliver units over a sustained period of 9 years and will produce 50 units per annum. This would be a significant contribution to the annual provision of housing at 16.8% of the total.	No	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	The site would help to deliver affordable housing and would be able to provide improvements to junction 13 of the M65. The Council has also bid for and received funding through the Strategic Conomic Plan funding recently announced by Government.	No
Land at the end of Knotts Drive & Railway Sidings	482	77	Within Settlement Boundary HMR Reserved Land for Housing	No Refused on appeal	Greenfield (482) and PDL (1036) site	being able to deliver a quantum of units per annum that would affects the delivery of housing across the Borough Not having it would, therefore, not be fundamental to the overall delivery of the housing requirement fort the		The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure including affordable housing.	Yes
Reedyford Mill	NN086	134	Within Settlement Boundary	Yes (expired) Developer seeking a commercial scheme on the site, planning permission for housing having expired.	PDL within Nelson. Slite typology not identified as viable in the DVS. A site specific developer viability study has shown that this site is viable.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	Planning permsision has been granted for the site but this has now expired. No objections from any statutory undertaker, Canals and Rivers Trust or LCC as highways authority.	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location. However, the site is not viable and is unlikely to come forward. This is demonstrated by the fact that it has received consent for residential use, but is now likely to be developed for commercial purposes.	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site can deliver housing in the right location. It can not however deliver affordable housing due to viability constraints	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure including affordable housing.	Yes
Former James Nelson's Sports Ground	NN110/199	106	Within Settlement Boundary HMR Reserved Land for Housing	Yes	Greenfield site within Nelson. The DVS does not indicate that this type of site is viable. Gleeson Homes has undertaken a site specific viability assessment confirming its viability.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	The site has a housing allocation. That was delivered subsequent to a public inquiry. Stakeholders were involved in that process. In additioan the site has planing permission with no objections from utility companies of LCC as highways authority.	The site is in the M65 Corridor and is capable of providing housing to support growth there. It is also in an accessible location. Evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the site cannot deliver affordable housing .	boundaries identified	The site can deliver housing in the right location. It can not however deliver affordable housing due to viability constraints	The site can deliver some public open space but no other infrastructure	Yes
Further Clough Head	S203	62	Within Settlement Boundary. Allocated as a housing site	No	Greenfield site within Brierfield. Site typology not identified as viable in the DVSbut within Council ownership and capable of being bvrought forward.	The site will not deliver housing on a scale that would make a significant contribution to the overall delivery of the housing requirement.	The site has a housing allocation. That was delivered subsequent to a public inquiry. Stakeholders were involved in that process.	However, the site is not viable and is unlikely to come	Definitive site boundaries identified	The site would deliver housing in an area that needs housing. Promoting new housing in sustainable locations is a national planning objective.	There is no evidence to suggest the site would deliver any infrastructure including affordable housing.	Yes

Strategic Housing Site Allocation



17 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



18 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



19 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



20 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



21 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



22 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



23 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



24 Strategic Housing Site Allocation







27 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



28 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



29 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



30 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



31 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



32 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



33 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



34 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



35 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



36 Strategic Housing Site Allocation



Planning Policy & ConservationPlanning & Building ControlPendle CouncilTown HallMarket StreetNelsonLancashireBB9 7LGTel:01282 661330Fax:01282 661720EmailIdf@pendle.gov.ukWebsite:www.pendle.gov.uk/planning



If you would like this information in a way which is better for you, please telephone us.

اگرآپ بیمعلومات کسی ایس شکل میں چا بتے ہیں، جو کہ آپ کے لئے زیادہ مُفید ہوتو برائے مہر بانی ہمیں ٹیلیفون کریں۔



