

# Pendle Core Strategy Plan Examination

## Barrowford Parish Council hearing statement

Submitted: 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015

---

### Session 2

#### Matter – Strategy for the Distribution of development

**1. Are the settlements identified in Policy SDP2 in the appropriate position in the settlement hierarchy?**

- In respect of Barrowford, the BPC (Barrowford Parish Council) disagree with the positioning. 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*'.
- Consider alternative for a 4<sup>th</sup> category of settlement ' Padiham bypass' which Barrowford has much more natural linkages with along the A6068 – smaller but related settlements of Higham, Fence and Wheatley Lane.
- Consider that a clearer more defined description of a Local Service Centre may be needed. Due to the contiguous nature of existing development between some Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres the use of the phrase 'localised catchment' could be used as justification by both developers and the Local Authority to propose and approve developments which would be more appropriately accommodated in a Key Service area.
- Consider that the description of catchment areas used for Local Service areas should incorporate 'within the existing village/town boundaries of that LSC.'

**1. Key Service Centres** – *these will provide the focus for future growth in the borough and accommodate the majority of new development.*

**2. Local Service Centres** – *these will play a supporting role to the Key Service Centres and accommodate levels of new development to serve a localised catchment.*

**3. Rural Service Centres** – *these settlements will provide the focus for growth in*

*Rural Pendle.*

**4. Rural Villages** – these settlements will accommodate development primarily to meet local needs.

*Taken from page 45 of the CS*

**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?**

- Yes, site selection criteria important to ensure that previously developed land within settlement boundaries are developed first. If these are simply left for reasons of poor viability then many of the urban sites of the borough will be left open to environmental and social neglect
  - There needs to be more proactive work on some of the urban cleared sites such as Riverside Mill, Reedyford Mill and the Bankhouse Road/Bradley Road house clearance area with involvement from Pendle Council working with agencies such as the HCA and Registered Providers eg. Housing Pendle to bring forward sites.
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.
- See related points above
  - Pendle Council and Housing Pendle need liaise with owners of PDL and in cases where there are larger vacant sites to help promote the site by producing short development briefs.
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)?
- LIV4, page 135 of the CS breaks the Borough into 4 spatial areas not 3. Can this be clarified?

**Table LIV4a - size threshold and area based affordable housing targets**

	M65 Corridor	M65 Corridor North	West Craven Towns	Rural Pendle
<5 dwellings	0%	0%	0%	0%
5-14 dwellings	0%	0%	0%	15-30%
15-49 dwellings	0%	0%	0-10%	20-30%
50-99 dwellings	0%	0%	0-5%	20-25%
100+ dwellings	0%	0%	0-5%	20-25%

- The table would indicate that only sites within West Craven and Rural Pendle would need to provide % affordable homes. Please clarify?
- In the case of Trough Laithe (Policy LIV2) the proposal wording asks for 20% affordable housing on site. This is not reflected within the table.
- See comments above on a potential 'Padiham By-pass' category

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?

- No, BPC do not consider that is sufficient enough justification for the percentage split
- BPC understands that along the M65 lies the highest concentration of population and therefore services and better access to public transport (overall higher sustainability) but feels that 70% is too higher a proportion and heavy reliance on the urban area to provide housing. It is equally important for the long term sustainability of parts of rural Pendle ie. West Craven and Rural Pendle that housing and employment are brought forward.
- Consider that the split be increased for West Craven and Rural Pendle to create a fairer distribution across the borough

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?

- BPC would like to see a breakdown of the M65 70% for the settlements across the M65
- Barrowford is the smallest component of the M65 Corridor, and the only defined Local Service Centre. As the Local Service centre states development should meet 'immediate local needs'. Given that Trough Laithe is a strategic site, and falls within Barrowford Parish the site is not just meeting local need but a borough wide need. The

70 % for the M65 corridor should be proportioned between the M65 settlements (both Key Service and Local Service centres).

- BPC feel that given the difference in the Local Hierarchy Barrowford should be given a specified % for both housing and employment land to reflect the lower status.
- BPC acknowledges that setting one figure for the M65 gives flexibility to the Local Authority to meet housing and employment land targets through the life of the CS. If Barrowford is a local service centre then why is providing for the rest of the borough.
- Under the 'Risks' for SDP3, suggested that 'insufficient viable rural sites be added as a medium risk. This is just a possible risk as sites within the M65 coming forward.

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?

- Yes, see comments to 5.

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?

- BPC Understand that along the M65 is the highest concentration of population and therefore services and better access to public transport (overall higher sustainability) but feels that 78.5% is too higher a proportion and heavy reliance on the urban area to provide employment. It is equally important for the long term sustainability of parts of rural Pendle ie. West Cravern and Rural Pendle that employment and housing are brought forward.
- Suggestion that appropriate design and use of materials in rural employment sites is given reference too or a linkage to a potential Development Management policy