

PENDLE CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

Agenda 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?
Does the identification of Barrowford as a Local Service Centre reflect the proposal for a strategic housing site in the settlement?
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?
Is there sufficient guidance on anticipated growth levels?
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)?
In this regard does the wording of Policy SDP2 represent a sequential approach to site selection that would be contrary to national policy?
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?
For example should more or less housing be guided to the M65 corridor?
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?
Should there be provision for contingency sites to come 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

PENDLE CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

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?

Is too much employment to be guided towards the M65 corridor?

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 (MM002).

Participants

PBC (*statement HS2/001*)

Turley Associates (for Peel Investments (North) Ltd) (*statement HS2/004 and representation 868120*)

Pam Smith (*representation 868476*)

Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore (for Junction Property Ltd) (*statement HS2/002 and representation 818046*)

Matthew Good, HBF (*statement HS2/003 and representation 755915*)

Barrowford Parish Council (*statement HS2/005 and representation 327467*)

John Lamb, Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside (*representation 327387*)

Stuart Booth, JWPC (for Beck Developments) (*statement HS1/006 and representations 817585 & 868081*)