

**26.03.15**

## **Representation to the Inspector for Pendle Strategic Development Plan – Hearing**

### **Session 6.**

Pendle Council has taken advice from land owners at Trough Laithe in terms of deliverability. In the case of the Strategic Housing Site, the developer has suggested a delivery rate of 50 houses per year from 2015 to an uplifted maximum from 481 to 500 houses based on 12.96ha of land.

Furthermore, in a meeting with Councillor Joseph Cooney 21.11.14, he suggested that Barratt Homes had been provisionally approached by the land owner at Trough Laithe and that executive houses were preferred by the developer.

This gives cause for concern, as surely it is Pendle Council who should be influencing the type of development? ie. Are we not in need of affordable and social housing?

During an exchange of communication with Andrew Stephenson MP via social media w/c 17 November 2014, Mr Stephenson said “...Sadly Peel who own the land want housing rather than employment, so the council have had to put this down as a possible strategic housing site.”

Does the Council not have a choice of what to develop?

By his very own admission Mr Stephenson MP admits the council have been led by the developer to allocate the land as a strategic housing site.

The significant issue is the lack of scientific approach from Pendle Council to identify suitable land for housing. More so there is evidence within the strategy of a naïve panic to secure land in response to the Central Government edit.

The Council is ignoring the large number of potential sites put forwards during the previous consultations. Responses from the Council to the vast majority (if not all) of objecting respondents in the previous consultation depict a blanket response which does not respond directly to queries.

For example; in the Councils ‘call for sites’, Page 113 – Respondent Reference Number - 818033– Owners of land North of Wheatley Lane Road – The Council admits that the Trough Laithe site has been chosen to due its ease of delivery and does not counter the proposal put forwards by ‘Owners of Land North of Wheatley Lane Road’ other than by stating that the development of a single Local Plan would take time.

Surely, time is what we have got?

The decision to build 500 plus houses on a green field site should not be taken lightly and we should take as much time as is required to be completely satisfied that sufficient research has been undertaken. At this time, satisfactory detail has not been provided nor communicated.

Some excellent and appropriate sites were put forwards by third parties, the vast majority of which have been discounted. Albeit with their own issues, why has the land to the rear of Lupton Drive, Barrowford not being considered, or the land to the rear of St Thomas Primary school. Both parcels of land cannot be seen from elsewhere in the valley. Although, both are still Greenfield.

In addition and most importantly the ONS stated in their paper dated May 2014 that the projected population growth in the Pendle area will increase only marginally during the plan period.

There has been very little house building over the past 10 years due to lack of demand.

There is a clear dichotomy between Pendle Councils perceived 'under supply' of housing and the actual demand for housing.

Therefore how can the Council justify the release of such a sizeable parcel of land to housing developers?

Current house building rates for Pendle show that only 7 houses per annum are constructed, this suggests there is a distinct lack of demand for the type of houses on offer i.e. detached 'executive' properties.

Mix this assumption of detached executive houses with a large site of 12.96 ha and the council will have a failed development on their hands with little or no take up for the new homes as people in that type of market prefer smaller more exclusive developments.

First of all, we must understand the typology of housing unit? Is this number made up of; Affordable housing, social housing, retirement housing, assisted living, apartments, detached 'executive' houses, bungalows, semi-detached, terraced housing etc?

Section 3.34 to 3.49 in PBCs document 'Our Spatial Issues: Pendle Today', you major on the deprivation and overcrowded housing and the need for more affordable housing, yet you clearly contradict yourselves as Councillor Joseph Cooney admitted (meeting 21.11.14) that Peel have a preference for high yield Executive housing for Trough Laithe.

Most of all with house building on the perceived scale of Trough Laithe Farm there will be a need for significant investment in social infrastructure; where is the new £6m to £10m primary school, where is the nursery as promised by the business park development to the lower part of the site, where is the new doctors surgery, where is the new dentist. Is the developer willing to fund this type of social infrastructure through the CIL or Sc106?

Kind regards,

Paul Henderson