

26.03.15

Representation to the Inspector for Pendle Strategic Development Plan – Hearing

Session 10

As is well documented, Colne, Nelson and Barrowford suffer from significant traffic congestion issues. This is being reviewed via a different strategy in the form of bypassing the worst hit areas.

Given the type of high yield housing that the strategic housing site at Trough Laithe would provide, it would be safe to assume upwards of three cars (plus) per household (not including visitors). This equates to $500 \times 3 = 1500$ extra cars to an already congested area.

Clearly this further adds to the requirement for road infrastructure upgrades. With respect to the Strategic Housing Site at Trough Laithe, 1500 extra cars would cause melt down to the local road network, specifically if taking into consideration; the junction to Carr Hall Road and Wheatley Lane Road, Church Street and to Gisburn Road running through the village.

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?

Should Pendle Council be forced into the retention of Trough Laithe Farm within their ultimate strategy then the suggestion is rather than considering the whole of the parcel of land in one single move; The land should be 'parcelled' and handed to developers in a phased manner i.e. split into thirds, fifths etc with a new planning application for each segment based on proof of demand, typologies, links with social infrastructure including schools and providing a full socioeconomic impact assessment, traffic impact assessments and preferably an Environment Impact Assessment at each phase.

Equally, design lead proposals should be considered seeking to build communities rather than turn their backs on well established residential areas by making 'islands' out of existing groups of houses. Sufficient green buffers should be designed into schemes between existing houses and new build development, eg village greens, woodland walks and trails rather than the usual 1800mm high fence with back to back gardens and the required 21m between living spaces – This does not present 'good design'.

Kind regards,

Paul Henderson