

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

## MATTERS AND ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED AT HEARING SESSIONS

<b>Hearings Commence:</b>	<b>Tuesday 14 April 2015</b>
<b>Venue for Sessions 14 to 16 April 2015</b>	The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall, Market Street, Nelson, Lancashire, BB9 7LG
<b>Venue for Sessions 28 April 2015</b>	The Play Room, The Ace Centre, Cross Street, Nelson, Lancashire, BB9 7NH
<b>Inspector:</b>	Mark Dakeyne BA (Hons) MRTPI
<b>Programme Officer:</b>	Derek Thomas Programme Office Nelson Town Hall, Market Street, Nelson, BB9 7LG
<b>Tel:</b>	<b>01282 661658</b>
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:programme.officer@pendle.gov.uk">programme.officer@pendle.gov.uk</a>
<b>Website:</b>	<a href="http://www.pendle.gov.uk/examination">www.pendle.gov.uk/examination</a>

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 1 – 09.30 Tuesday 14 April 2015**

**The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall**

**Matter - Procedural and Overarching Matters**

The purpose of this session is to explore whether the Core Strategy (CS) has been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements set out in the Planning Act 2004 and the Development Plan Regulations 2012 and to consider some overarching matters.

The 2004 Act and 2012 Regulations sets out requirements for a Local Development Scheme (LDS), that regard has been had to the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and the Plan has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). There are provisions relating to the Duty to Cooperate (DTC), publication and notification requirements and dealing with representations.

The Government has a preference for a single Local Plan document drawn up for a period of 15 years. The Council has elected to produce this CS followed by a Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Document (SAP). The CS has a timeframe of 2011-2030.

Welcome and Introductory Matters.

Council Opening Statement, addressing legal and procedural requirements.

**Issues:**

1. Have the consultation methods used for the Plan and contained within the SCI been satisfactory?
2. Have all relevant documents been available and subject to consultation?
3. Has the Council complied with the DTC, particularly in relation to the distribution of housing within the Burnley and Pendle Housing Market Area and the consideration of strategic sites for employment? *See in particular C/004 for Council's response.*
4. Has the preparation of a series of documents rather than a single Local Plan been clearly justified, particularly the deferral of site allocations? *See in particular C/004 for Council's response.*
5. Is the timeframe for the CS appropriate?
6. Is the drafting of the policies sufficiently clear on what will or will not be permitted? Do they provide a clear indication as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? Are they concise expressions of

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

policy, excluding policy explanation and guidance?

7. Is the Plan clear as to whether a review of Green Belt boundaries will be necessary as part of the SAP?

## **Main Evidence Base**

CD/02/01 – LDS

CD/09/01 – SCS

CD/02/02 – SCI

CD/01/02a – SA

CD/01/03 – Habitat Regulations Assessment

CD/01/05 – Statement of Compliance with the DTC

CD/01/09 – Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist

CD/01/10 – Legal Compliance Checklist

C/004 – Council response to Inspector's Further Questions

C/006 – Council response to questions within Preliminary Schedule of Matters and Issues

## **Suggested Modifications**

The Council proposes a Modification to the Plan to include paragraph 7.6 within Policy SDP1 to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (see C/004).

## **Participants**

Pendle Borough Council (PBC)

Shelia Smith

Pam Smith

John and Alison Plackett

Paul Henderson

Matt Gordon

Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore

Matthew Good, Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Stuart Booth, JWPC

John Lamb, The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & N Merseyside

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 2 – 11.00 Tuesday 14 April 2015**

**The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall**

**Matter - Strategy for the Distribution of Development**

The purpose of this session is to explore whether the strategy for the distribution of development is justified.

The CS proposes a hierarchy of settlements (Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres, Rural Service Centres and Rural Villages) and distributes housing and employment by spatial areas – the M65 corridor, West Craven Towns and Rural Pendle.

**Issues:**

1. Are the settlements identified in Policy SDP2 in the appropriate position in the settlement hierarchy?
2. As anticipated growth levels are to be included within Policy SDP2 (see Suggested Modification below) is it necessary to include site selection criteria for new development as shown?
3. Does Policy SDP2 provide the framework to encourage the effective use of brownfield land? For example should there be a locally appropriate target for the % of brownfield land in selecting sites for new development? Or is the policy too prescriptive in this regard in prioritising previously-developed land (PDL)? *See in particular C/004 for Council's response to the issue of a specific target for the amount of brownfield land to be developed.*
4. Is the division of the Borough into 3 spatial areas appropriate? For example should the M65 corridor be split into more than one spatial area as suggested by Policy LIV4 (M65 Corridor and M65 Corridor North)?
5. Is the distribution of housing between the spatial areas within Policy SDP3 justified and will it allow the housing needs of the Borough to be met?
6. Does Policy SDP3 incorporate sufficient flexibility to allow the Borough to deliver sufficient new homes, if one of the spatial areas is under performing?
7. Should a greater proportion of housing development be assigned to the West Craven Towns and Rural Pendle to aid delivery, particularly in the early years of the Plan?
8. Is the distribution of employment between the spatial areas within Policy SDP4 justified and will it allow the economic needs of the Borough to be met?

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

## **Main Evidence Base**

CD/03/01 – Pendle Sustainable Settlements Study  
CD/04/01 – Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)  
CD/04/02 – Pendle Housing Needs Study Update Report  
CD/04/03 – Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)  
CD/05/01 – Pendle Employment Land Review  
C/004 – Council response to Inspector's Further Questions

## **Suggested Modifications**

The Council proposes a Modification to the Plan to include anticipated growth levels for each settlement category from paragraph 7.22 into Policy SDP2 (see C/004).

## **Participants**

PBC  
Andrew Bickerdike, Turley Associates  
Pam Smith  
Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore  
Matthew Good, HBF  
Barrowford Parish Council  
Chris Gowlett, Persimmon Homes  
John Lamb, The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and N. Merseyside

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 3 – 14.00 Tuesday 14 April 2015**

**The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall**

**Matter - The Environment, Design and Energy**

The purpose of this session is to consider whether the policies of the CS on the built and natural environments and design are justified and will be effective.

Policies ENV1 to ENV7 deal with a range of environmental and design issues whilst there are separate policies on the design of homes, places of work and public places.

## **Issues**

1. Will the policies of the Plan be effective in protecting the natural and built environment? Does Policy ENV1 provide sufficient distinction between different levels of designation (paragraph 113 of the Framework refers)?
2. Have biodiversity and green infrastructure considerations been fully taken into account in preparing the Plan, including cross boundary wildlife sites and networks?
3. Does Policy ENV2 sufficiently promote and reinforce local distinctiveness such as that arising from the Leeds-Liverpool Canal?
4. Are the requirements for sustainable design within the policies of the Plan such as Policy ENV2 too prescriptive and likely to affect the viability of new development? Are there any implications for the wording of Policy ENV2 from the Government's announcement about possible exemptions for small builders from low carbon/zero carbon requirements?
5. Is the strong encouragement for the use of Building for Life standards justified?
6. Is the plan sufficiently clear on what is expected from developers in terms of sustainable design/construction measures? Are any such measures consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and nationally described standards?

## **Main Evidence Base**

CD/08/06 – Pendle Biodiversity Audit

CD/08/17 – Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan

CD/08/20 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study

CD/10/01 – North West Best Practice Design Guide

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

## **Participants**

PBC

Jane Wood, Friends of the Earth (FOE)

Pam Smith

John and Alison Plackett

Martyn Coy, Canal and River Trust

Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore

Matthew Good, HBF

John Lamb, The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & N Merseyside

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

## **Session 4 – 09.30 Wednesday 15 April 2015**

### **The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall**

#### **Matter - The Housing Requirement**

The purpose of this session is to explore whether the amount of housing proposed in the CS and the trajectory is appropriate to meet the needs of the Borough to 2030.

The Council has used the Office of National Statistics (ONS) 2012-based Sub-National Population Projections (SNPP) as a basis for its housing requirements. The Council proposes making provision for some 5,662 (net) dwellings (Policy LIV1) but with delivery increasing over the Plan period from 220 dwellings to 353 dwellings per annum.

#### **Issues**

1. Is the housing requirement justified taking into account population and household growth projections, including migration and demographic change, market signals and proposed economic growth? Do any recently released figures suggest that the requirement should be amended e.g. DCLG household projections February 2015?
2. Do the 2012-based SNPP form a reasonable basis for assessing the housing requirement given the extent that they have been influenced by low completion rates in recent years?
3. Is the housing requirement justified taking into account the need for affordable housing and homes for different groups, the demand for housing and the need to boost significantly the supply of housing?
4. Have the options for higher growth identified in the SHMA been fully considered, including their potential impacts?
5. Is there sufficient flexibility built into the housing requirement?
6. Is the stepped approach to housing delivery justified? Will it fully meet the need and demand for housing in the early years of the plan?

#### **Main Evidence Base**

CD/04/01 – SHMA



# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

CD/04/02 – Pendle Housing Needs Study Update Report

CD/04/03 – SHLAA

## **Suggested Modifications**

The Council proposes that the housing requirement within Policy LIV1 is expressed as a minimum as suggested by paragraph 10.32.

## **Participants**

PBC

Matthew Good, HBF

Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore

Stuart Booth, JWPC Ltd

Andrew Bickerdike, Turley Associates

Shelia Smith

Pam Smith

Peter Vernon, Vernon and Co

Paul Walton, PWA Planning

Mark Roberts

Matt Gordon

Paul Henderson

Christopher Gowlett, Persimmon Homes

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 5 – 11.00 Wednesday 15 April 2015**

**The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall**

**Matter - How Is The Housing Requirement To Be Met?**

The purpose of this session is to consider whether the proposals to meet the housing requirement have been justified and will be effective.

The Plan proposes a strategic housing site within the CS but otherwise relies on the SAP to bring forward sites additional to those already committed. Policy LIV1 refers to empty properties and regeneration areas but does not quantify how such sources of supply will contribute to the housing requirement. The Council advises that specific windfall sites are included in the 5 year land supply so an allowance within Policy LIV1 would not be appropriate as windfalls are not a dependable source of supply.

The Plan needs to demonstrate how the housing requirement will be delivered over the Plan period, including the maintenance of a five year housing supply.

## **Issues**

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.*
2. What contribution will be made to the housing requirement from bringing back empty homes into use? *See in particular C/004 for Council's response.*
3. Is there sufficient emphasis on the contribution that can be made from Housing Regeneration Priority Areas?
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?
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

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

refers to a development framework produced by the developer)

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?
7. Does Policy LIV2 (or Policy SUP3) need to address any capacity issues in local schools?
8. Is the affordable housing target of 20% for Trough Laithe justified?
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?
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.*
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?
12. Is a five year supply likely to be deliverable given the reliance on sites without planning permission and with policy constraints?
13. Is the requirement within Policy LIV1 for applicants to demonstrate deliverability necessary?

## **Main Evidence Base**

CD/04/01 – SHMA

CD/04/02 – Pendle Housing Needs Study Update Report

CD/04/03 – SHLAA

CD/04/04 – Strategic Housing Land Site Allocation Report

CD/07/01 – Pendle Development Viability Study

C/004 – Council response to Inspector's Further Questions

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

## **Suggested Modifications**

There is a proposed Modification to include a table in the justification to Policy LIV1 showing how the housing requirement will be met with the table cross-referenced in the policy.

The table referred to above does not include a specific allowance from bringing empty homes back into use as the evidence is currently being updated.

A housing implementation strategy is to be included as an Appendix to the Plan.

## **Participants**

PBC

Peter Vernon, Vernon and Co

John Willcock, JWPC Ltd

Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore

Stuart Booth, JWPC

Andrew Bickerdike, Turley Associates

Pam Smith

P Daniel

Christopher Johnson

John and Alison Plackett

Paul Henderson

Shelia Smith

Mark Roberts

Paul Walton, PWA Planning

Jeff and Jacquie Noon

Matthew Good, HBF

Barrowford Parish Council

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 6 – 15.00 Wednesday 15 April 2015**

**The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall**

**Matter - Housing Needs**

The purpose of this session is to explore whether the Plan addresses the needs for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community.

The Plan has a target that 40% of housing will be affordable. However, because of viability issues, the Council's target ranges for the spatial areas of the Borough are well below 40%.

Policies within the Plan indicate the priority to be given to meeting different housing needs and the proportions of property types and sizes that should be sought.

## **Issues**

1. Is the affordable housing target of 40% appropriate having regard to the evidence base of housing need?
2. Is the affordable housing target realistic and deliverable having regard to the doubts over the viability of the % of affordable housing provision that can be delivered and the area based affordable housing targets within Policy LIV4? *See in particular C/004 for Council's response.*
3. Are the sized threshold and area based affordable housing targets in Table LIV4a justified and deliverable? Should affordable housing contributions be sought on a greater range of housing developments e.g. green field sites in the M65 corridor?
4. How are different mechanisms expected to contribute to the target e.g. obligations on market housing sites, sites developed by social housing providers, exception sites, commuted sums, empty homes back into use, regeneration areas?
5. Is the requirement to retest viability if development does not start in 2 years within Policy LIV4 justified?
6. Is the tenure split proposed by Policy LIV4 justified? Should 'open market discounted housing' be considered as an option?
7. Is the guide to the property types and sizes within Tables LIV5a and LIV5b justified by the existing supply of small terraced houses, the requirement for lower density in some areas and the objective of higher value/aspirational

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

housing? *See in particular C/004 for Council's response and the indicative guidance in Policy LIV5 that 60% of new dwellings should be either detached or semi-detached.*

## **Main Evidence Base**

CD/04/01 – SHMA

CD/04/02 – Pendle Housing Needs Study Update Report

CD/04/03 – SHLAA

CD/04/04 – Strategic Housing Land Site Allocation Report

CD/07/01 – Pendle Development Viability Study

C/004 – Council response to Inspector's Further Questions

C/006 – Council response to questions within Preliminary Schedule of Matters and Issues

## **Suggested Modifications**

The Council suggests Modifications to Policy LIV4 and its justification to explain the differences between 'need' and what can realistically be delivered.

It is proposed to amend the site size threshold for affordable housing in Rural Pendle (Table LIV4a) to reflect the recent change to the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

## **Participants**

PBC

Andrew Bickerdike, Turley Associates

Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore

Matthew Good, HBF

Christopher Gowlett, Persimmon Homes

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 7 – 09.30 Thursday 16 April 2015**

**The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall**

**Matter - How Is the Employment Requirement To Be Met?**

The purpose of this session is to consider whether the proposals to meet the employment requirement have been justified and will be effective.

The Plan proposes a strategic employment site within the CS at Lomeshaye but otherwise relies on the SAP to bring forward any sites additional to those already committed.

## **Issues**

1. Are the circumstances sufficiently exceptional to justify the release of Green Belt land at Lomeshaye for a strategic employment site and, if so, have these been justified in the CS? For example have the options for the use of previously-developed land been fully considered? *See in particular C/004 for Council's response including the need for employment land to meet the full requirements of the Borough and the lack of other suitable sites beyond the Green Belt.*
2. Is the Lomeshaye site deliverable? Is Policy WRK3 clear on how and what will be delivered? Are B8 uses appropriate? Are there any significant constraints such as access, topography, flood risk and biodiversity which may prevent the site coming forward?
3. Will the proposed new Green Belt boundary endure beyond the Plan period so that it has permanence or is there a need to identify 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt?
4. Is the site at Lomeshaye capable of being made accessible by public transport, walking and cycling?
5. Will Policies WRK1 and WRK2 be effective in supporting the sustainable growth of all types of businesses and sustainable jobs in rural and other areas?
6. Is it necessary for Policy WRK2 to refer to the Riverside Business Park?

## **Main Evidence Base**

CD/05/01 – Pendle Employment Land Review

CD/05/02 – Strategic Employment Land Site Allocation Report Parts 1 and 2

CD/05/03 – Pendle Jobs and Growth Strategy

CD/05/07 – Lancashire Strategic Economic Plan

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

CD/05/12 – How Pennine Lancashire Can Contribute To The Economic Objectives of the Lancashire LEP

C/004 – Council response to Inspector's Further Questions

## **Suggested Modifications**

There is a proposed Modification to the Plan to make it clear in Policy WRK2 that at least 25 ha of new employment land will be allocated over the lifetime of the Plan (including Lomeshaye). The net developable area of the Lomeshaye Site is approximately 16ha. It is suggested that a site allocation will also be required in West Craven which would be progressed through the SAP.

## **Participants**

PBC

Angela Arnold

Andrew Bickerdike, Turley Associates

Pam Smith

Shelia Smith

Jane Wood, FOE

Beverley Bailey

P Daniel

Barrowford Parish Council



# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 8 – 12.00 Thursday 16 April 2015**

**The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall**

**Matter - Retail**

The purpose of this session is to consider whether the approach of the CS to the retail hierarchy and shopping provision is sound.

Policy SDP5 refers to major retail development being located in the main town centres of Nelson, Colne and Barnoldswick. There is no reference to the specific capacity of existing centres to accommodate new town centre development. The Council indicates that existing commitments have satisfied the need for convenience goods floorspace but that there is a small amount of capacity for comparison goods from 2023 onwards (see C/004).

## **Issues**

1. Is the Plan clear as to the position of centres in the retail hierarchy? In this respect should Policy SDP5 be more explicit as to the definition of the hierarchy of centres?
2. Is the Plan clear in indicating the up to date capacity for convenience and comparison goods floorspace in its area, taking into account recent commitments?
3. Is the Plan clear as to the capacity for floorspace in each centre in the retail hierarchy to facilitate the management and growth of the centres?
4. Does Policy WRK4 provide a clear policy for the consideration of proposals for main town centre uses which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres? Is the policy unduly restrictive?
5. Does the CS plan positively for the future of Nelson Town Centre to encourage economic activity and arrest its decline?

## **Main Evidence Base**

CD/06/01 – Pendle Retail Capacity Study

CD/06/02 – Pendle Retail Capacity Update

C/004 – Council response to Inspector's Further Questions

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

## Participants

PBC

Jane Wood, FOE

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 9 –14.00 Thursday 16 April 2015**

**The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall**

**Matter - Tourism/Leisure/Culture and Community Facilities**

The purpose of this session is to explore CS policies on tourism/leisure/culture and the provision and protection of community facilities including open space.

Policy WRK5 supports the provision of new or improved tourism, leisure and cultural facilities where they meet criteria relating to sustainable development.

Policy ENV1 refers to the protection of existing open space and Policy LIV5 to the provision of open space in new housing development but no specific requirements are set out in the CS.

## **Issues**

1. Does the CS place enough emphasis on the tourism role of the Borough's towns, as well as the rural areas?
2. Does Policy WRK5 provide the appropriate means of making the most of the asset of Pendle Hill and the associated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?
3. By what means will development contribute towards the provision of any community needs generated by the development (Policy SUP1)?
4. How are deficits in open space and outdoor recreation in certain parts of the Borough to be made up during the Plan period? *See in particular C/004 for Council's response and the intention to produce a Green Infrastructure Strategy.*
5. Will the Plan be effective in ensuring that new development contributes to the provision and/or enhancement of open space? *See in particular C/004 for Council's response.*
6. Should the CS identify areas for special protection as Local Green Space?

## **Main Evidence Base**

CD/09/01 – SCS

CD/09/04 – Strategy for the Provision of School Places

CD/05/03 – Pendle Jobs and Growth Strategy

CD/08/10 – Pendle Open Space Audit

C/004 – Council response to Inspector's Further Questions

## **Suggested Modifications**

A Modification is proposed to Policy LIV5 to clarify that the Council envisage that

## PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

there will be a policy in the SAP to deal with the amount of open space to be provided in developments.

### **Participants**

PBC

Shelia Smith

Pam Smith

John and Alison Plackett

P Daniel

Matthew Good, HBF

John Lamb, The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and N Merseyside

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

## **Session 10 – 09.30 Tuesday 28 April 2015**

### **The Play Room, The Ace Centre, Cross Street, Nelson**

#### **Matter - The Provision of Infrastructure and the Delivery of the Plan**

The purpose of the session is to consider the mechanisms for delivery of the Plan with appropriate supporting infrastructure.

A key test of soundness is whether the Plan will be effective and deliverable over its period. Delivery of infrastructure alongside development is also important.

#### **Issues**

1. Will the policy requirements of the Plan, such as affordable housing and infrastructure, allow development to go ahead with a competitive return for a willing landowner and developer?
2. Will Policy SDP6 be effective in ensuring that off-site infrastructure necessary to enable the development to go ahead will be provided? Should the policy be more specific in identifying infrastructure which has a high importance for delivery of the Plan (see Appendix A)? For example M65 Junction 13 improvements, waste water treatment plants, primary school capacity, open space provision?
3. What are the implications of not introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on the provision of off-site infrastructure given the limitations on the use of pooled contributions?
4. Does Policy SDP6 and its implications for the requirement for obligations meet the tests set out in paragraph 204 of the Framework?
5. Will infrastructure be delivered in a timely fashion?
6. What infrastructure will be required in the first 5 years of the Plan and can it be delivered?
7. How will essential infrastructure be funded?
8. What are the consequences for the Plan if critical infrastructure is not delivered?
9. Have the needs for strategic infrastructure such as an A56 bypass and the reopening of the Colne-Skipton railway been appropriately justified and addressed in the CS?
10. Does the CS sufficiently exploit the potential for sustainable travel modes

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

such as cycling?

## **Main Evidence Base**

CD/07/01 – Pendle Development Viability Study

CD/07/02 – Pendle Infrastructure Strategy

CD/07/05 – East Lancs Highways and Transport Masterplan

## **Participants**

PBC

Jane Wood, FOE

Pam Smith

P Daniel

Matt Gordon

David Penney, Skipton East Lancashire Rail Action Partnership (SELRAP)

Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 11 – 11.30 Tuesday 28 April 2015**  
**The Play Room, The Ace Centre, Cross Street, Nelson**  
**Matter - Other Matters**

The purpose of the session is to consider issues raised by representors that have not been covered in other hearings.

**Issues**

1. Should Policy 12 of the Pendle Local Plan 2001-2016 (Maintaining Settlement Character) be replaced by the CS?
2. Are the definitions within the Glossary (Appendix C) consistent with national policy e.g. that relating to open space?

**Main Evidence Base**

Replacement Pendle Local Plan 2001-2016

**Participants**

PBC

Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore

# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 12 – 12.00 Tuesday 28 April 2015**  
**The Play Room, The Ace Centre, Cross Street, Nelson**  
**Matter - Implementation, Monitoring and Flexibility**

The purpose of the session is to consider whether the CS includes clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring and is flexible enough to deal with changing circumstances.

Each policy of the Plan includes indicators and targets and triggers for further investigation.

**Issues**

1. Will the CS provide a robust policy basis for determination of applications and not become outdated?
2. Is the Monitoring Framework, including the indicators and targets/triggers, SMART?

**Participants**

PBC



# PENDLE CORE STRATEGY PLAN EXAMINATION

---

**Session 13 – 14.00 Tuesday 28 April 2015**  
**The Play Room, The Ace Centre, Cross Street, Nelson**  
**Matter - Review and Conclusions**

The purpose of the session is to review the findings of the hearing sessions, to confirm what Main Modifications, if any, are proposed to the CS, and discuss how the Examination will proceed hereafter.

**Participants**

PBC