

dynamic development solutions  $^{\mathsf{TM}}$ 



Pendle Borough Council Green Belt Assessment Criteria and Methodology Consultation Summary

> Prepared by Alex Roberts DLP Planning Ltd Sheffield

> > July 2016





Pre	pared	bν	<i>ı</i> :

Alex Roberts, Associate Director

Approved by:

Paul Jobson, Director

Date: July 2016

# **DLP Planning Ltd**

Ground Floor V1 Velocity Tenter Street Sheffield S1 4BY

Tel: 01142 289190 Fax: 01142 721947

DLP Consulting Group disclaims any responsibility to the client and others in respect of matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence. This report is confidential to the client and DLP Planning Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.











dynamic development solutions  $^{\text{IM}}$ 

Co	ntents	Page
0.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1.0	Green Belt Assessment Methodology Consultation	7
	Green Belt Consultation	7
2.0	Summary of Consultation Responses	8
	Consultation responses received	8





## 0.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 0.1 DLP (Planning) Limited and Liz Lake Associates have been commissioned by Pendle Council to undertake an assessment of the Green Belt within the borough.
- 0.2 The overall aim of the study is to undertake an independent and comprehensive assessment of the extent to which Green Belt land within the borough performs against the five purposes of Green Belt, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 80), namely:
  - 1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
  - 2. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
  - **3.** to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
  - 4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
  - **5.** to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 0.3 The brief also indicates that the study should examine the case for including within the Green Belt any additional areas of land that currently lie outside the designated Green Belt boundary.
- 0.4 The purpose of this work is to provide clear and robust conclusions on the relative value of each identified parcel of land to the Green Belt.
- 0.5 This assessment will form a critical part of the emerging Local Plan evidence base and will be used to inform the identification and allocation of sites suitable for development, confirm Green Belt boundaries beyond the plan period and identify potential safeguarded land for potential future development. In addition to this, the potential to extend existing Green Belt boundaries in some areas will be considered. Therefore the assessment must be able to stand up to scrutiny through public consultation and crucially through independent examination.





0.6 The purpose of this document is to summarise the consultation undertaken with key stakeholders to allow them to consider the proposed criteria and methodology to be used in carrying out the Green Belt assessment for Pendle Council.





# 1.0 GREEN BELT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY CONSULTATION

# **Green Belt Consultation**

- 1.1 The six-week consultation on the Green Belt methodology ran from **Monday 9 May to Monday 20 June 2016** and was organised by the Council; who contacted key stakeholders directly and placed the draft documents on their website.
- 1.2 A workshop event was held on 2 June 2016 and attended by 15 people (table1). At the workshop the methodology of the Green Belt assessment was presented and then discussion moved onto specific land parcels, with participants presenting their suggestions on suitable boundaries for these. The comments we received will be used when identifying the individual land parcels that will form the basis for the assessment.

Table 1 Workshop Attendees

e i workshop Attendees				
Organisation	Contact			
Local Authority Officers				
Burnley Borough Council	Pete Milward			
Lancashire County Council	Marcus Hudson			
Key Stakeholders				
National Trust	Claire Walters			
Pendle Borough Council Officers				
Housing & Economic Regeneration	Julie Whittaker			
Parish Councils				
Barrowford Parish Council	Robert Oliver			
Barrowford Parish Council	Iain Lord			
Blacko Parish Council	Neil Hodgson			
Colne Town Council	see below			
Higham-with-West Close-Booth Parish Council	Robin Willoughby			
Trawden Forest Parish Council	Barry Hodgson			
Trawden Forest Parish Council	Adrian Foulkes			
Neighbourhood Plan Leads				
Barrowford ( also Barrowford Ward Councillor)	Ken Turner			
Other Groups				
Lidgett & Beyond Group	John Birchenough			
Lidgett & Beyond Group	Mark Turner			
Lidgett & Beyond Group (also Boulsworth Ward Councillor and Colne Town Council)	Sarah Cockburn-Price			





# 2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

# Consultation responses received

- 2.1 A total of four (4) consultation responses were received from the following organisations (see Appendix 1 of this document for the full responses):
  - Historic England
  - Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)
  - National Trust
  - Lidgett & Beyond Group -(a local interest group concerned with development proposals to the east of Colne)
- 2.2 The consultation responses received were in some cases expansive and covered several topic areas not directly related to this Green Belt assessment. Table 2 summarises only those comments that relate to matters that will be considered in the Green Belt assessment. Table 2 also sets out the actions that DLP and the Council will take to further consider, or amend the methodology.
- 2.3 Some comments were made on particular land parcels and these will be considered, alongside those made at the workshop, when identifying the individual Green Belt land parcels.

 Table 2
 Summary of Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Historic England	No comments made	N/A	N/A
Campaign to Protect	Paragraph 15 of their	It is for the local	None
Rural England	letter.	planning authority	
	"CPRE does not	(Pendle Council) to	
	agree that 'aspiration	establish the	
	for future growth'	exceptional	
	constitutes an	circumstances for	
	exceptional	Green Belt release.	
	circumstance in itself,		
	as economic growth	The purpose of the	
	is a perennial and	Green Belt	
	constant desired	Assessment is to	
	outcome of public	reach an evidenced	
	policy. The 'need' for	and justified view on	
	future growth has	the purpose of the	
	always underpinned	Green Belt in Pendle.	
	the purported case	The assessment will	
	for exceptional	be used in	
	circumstances"	conjunction with other	
		evidence base	
		documents prepared	
		by the Council, for	
		them to reach a	
		'planning judgement'	
		as to which areas of	
		Green Belt, if any,	
		may be released for	
		possible future	
		development.	
Campaign to Protect	Summary of	We acknowledge that	None





dynamic development solutions  $^{\text{IM}}$ 

Rural England	paragraph 25 of their	the National Planning	
	letter.	Policy Framework	
		(NPPF) requires the	
	Do not release land	Council to	
	from the Green Belt	demonstrate	
	through the 'rounding	"exceptional	
	off' process.	circumstances" for	
	Exceptional	Green Belt release in	
	circumstances need	a review of its Local	
	to exist.	Plan. It is also	
		important to consider	
		the permanence of	
		the Green Belt and to	
		ensure that strong	
		boundaries exist on	
		the ground. (Para	
		83).	
Campaign to Protect	Summary of	We acknowledge that	None
Rural England	paragraph 26 of their	the NPPF	
	letter.	encourages local	
		planning authorities	
	The review should	to plan positively to	
	establish how	enhance the positive	
	beneficial uses can	use of the Green Belt,	
	be delivered across	by providing	
	the study area.	opportunities for	
		access, outdoor sport	
		and recreation etc.	
		(Para 81).The brief	
		for the Pendle Green	
		Belt Assessment	
		does not cover this	
		aspect of the Green	





		Belt, but the Council	
		will explore this	
		through other parts of	
		their evidence base	
		(i.e. the Green	
		Infrastructure	
		Strategy).	
Campaign to Protect	Summary of	There is no	None
Rural England	paragraph 27 of their	requirement within	
	letter.	the NPPF to 'balance'	
		Green Belt losses	
	Undesignated Green	with gains.	
	Belt in the		
	countryside should be	The NPPF is clear	
	considered for Green	how new Green Belt	
	Belt extensions to off-	should be designated	
	set loss of Green Belt	and this is something	
	in other areas.	the assessment will	
		address. Each land	
		parcel will be	
		considered on its own	
		merits and not with	
		the objective to make	
		Green Belt gains if	
		areas are to be	
		removed.	
National Trust	Padiham should be	We welcome the	We will consult with
	identified as a historic	National Trusts	Burnley Council to
	town for the purposes	comments and will	establish the
	of assessing Green	consider identifying	approach taken to
	Belt purpose 4. The	Padiham as an	Padiham in their
	town is within	historic town.	Green Belt
	l		l





dynamic development solutions  $^{\text{IM}}$ 

	Burnley's	However, this would	assessment.
	administrative area,	be predicated on the	
	has a conservation	on-going Green Belt	If Padiham is treated
	area, a number of	assessment for	as a historic town in
	special features,	Burnley. To maintain	the Burnley Green
	buildings of special	consistency, we	Belt Review, we will
	architectural and	would need to treat	consider it in this
	historic interest. To	Padiham in the same	context within the
	the east of Padiham	way that Burnley	Pendle Green Belt
	lies Gawthorpe Hall a	Council has done in	Assessment.
	Grade 1 listed	its Green Belt	
	building.	Review.	The following is noted
			at paragraph 2.37 of
		Gawthorpe Hall lies	the Burnley Green
		outside of the urban	Belt Review
		area of Padiham and	(prepared by LUC)
		is a separate entity.	mentions Padiham
		We do not consider	and Gawthorpe.
		that the Hall	
		constitutes a town or	However, Table 4.1
		settlement.	shows that Criterion
			4(a), which considers
			impact on the historic
			environment was only
			considered on two
			parcels of land to the
			west of Padiham (47
			and 57a).
National Trust	Other attributes (flood	We agree with the	None
	risk, ecology) that	Trust, however it is	
	may preclude	not for the Green Belt	
	development should	assessment to	
	be considered.	consider 'other	





		attributes' as these	
		will be considered	
		through a different	
		evidence base	
		document; in this	
		case the Strategic	
		Flood Risk	
		Assessment.	
Lidgett and Beyond	Consider on a case	We acknowledge that	We will take the
	by case basis that	it can be a difficult	Group's comments
	minor roads with	process to determine	on board. When
	hedgerow or dry	what types of	considering the
	stone wall as a strong	boundary are strong	boundaries for land
	boundary.	or weak. This is why	parcels. Any
		the process we have	particularly strong
		outlined for	boundaries which fall
		determining land	into these categories
		parcels is a two stage	will be used, if they
		process: firstly desk	are considered to be
		based, then site	the most appropriate
		visits.	boundary for that
			parcel.
	Consider on a case	We acknowledge that	We will take the
	by case basis brooks	it can be a difficult	Group's comments
	and culverted	process to determine	on board. When
	watercourses as a	what types of	considering the
	strong boundary.	boundary are strong	boundaries for land
		or weak. This is why	parcels. Any
		the process we have	particularly strong
		outlined for	boundaries which are
		determining land	formed by a stream
		parcels is a two stage	or brook will be used,





	process: firstly desk	if it is considered to
	based, then site	be the most
	visits.	appropriate boundary
		for that parcel. The
		use of a culverted
		watercourse as a
		strong boundary is
		highly unlikely to be
		appropriate as it is
		doubtful that a
		distinctive surface
		feature will be
		associated with this.
Use landownership	Green Belt parcels	None
as a boundary	need to be defensible	
criterion	and identifiable on	
	the ground. Land	
	ownership does not	
	meet either of these	
	criteria.	
L&B made several	This assessment is	None
comments	concerned with the	
(paragraph 24 to 26)	contribution each	
in their response,	parcel of land	
regarding the	identified in the report	
appraisal of land	makes towards the	
parcels. In summary	five purposes of	
they requested that	Green Belt identified	
any parcel which	in the NPPF. It is for	
performs well against	the Council to decide	
any of the Green Belt	through the	
purposes should be	preparation of its	





removed from the site	Local Plan whether a	
allocations document.	particular land parcel	
	should be released	
	for future	
	development, when	
	taking into	
	consideration the	
	findings of this	
	assessment and	
	other evidence base	
	documents used in	
	plan preparation. In	
	short, this Green Belt	
	assessment should	
	not be used in	
	isolation to remove	
	potential sites from	
	consideration, but	
	should be used	
	alongside other	
	evidence base	
	documents in order to	
	reach a planning	
	judgement on each	
	site.	
Purpose 4 should	Purpose 4 concerns	None
include conservation	the setting of historic	
areas	towns. We have	
	considered this	
	purpose and	
	expanded it to include	
	all 'settlements' as	
	defined in Policy	
	-,	





	SDP2 of Local Plan	
	Part 1: Core Strategy	
	(December 2015).	
	Specific conservation	
	areas do not fit within	
	purpose 4, but may	
	be a consideration.	
Other assessment	The Council will need	None
criteria are not	to consider these	
reflected in the Green	relevant factors in the	
Belt assessment,	preparation of other	
such as;	evidence base	
sustainability, flood	documents.	
risk, agricultural land		
quality (BMV),	As set out at the	
geology.	workshop, the Green	
	Belt assessment is to	
	assess how well	
	parcels of land	
	perform against the	
	purposes of the	
	Green Belt. It is not	
	intended, nor would	
	we recommended to	
	the Council, that	
	other factors such as	
	those listed by L&B	
	be included in a	
	Green Belt	
	assessment.	







#### BEDFORD

4 Abbey Court Fraser Road Priory Business Park Bedford MK44 3WH

Tel: 01234 832 740 Fax: 01234 831 266 bedford@dlpconsultants.co.uk

#### BRISTO

Broad Quay House (5th floor) Prince Street Bristol BS1 4DJ

Tel: 0117 905 8850 bristol@dlpconsultants.co.uk

#### CARDIFF

Sophia House 28 Cathedral Road Cardiff CF11 9LJ

Tel: 029 2064 6810 cardiff@dlpconsultants.co.uk

#### LEEDS

Princes Exchange Princes Square Leeds LS1 4HY

Tel: 0113 280 5808 leeds@dlpconsultants.co.uk

### LONDON

The Green House 41-42 Clerkenwell Green London EC1R 0DU

Tel: 020 3761 5390 london@dlpconsultants.co.uk

#### MILTON KEYNES

Midsummer Court 314 Midsummer Boulevard Milton Keynes MK9 2UB

Tel: 01908 440 015 Fax: 01908 357 750

miltonkeynes@dlpconsultants.co.uk

### NOTTINGHAM

1 East Circus Street Nottingham NG1 5AF

Tel: 01158 966 620 nottingham@dlpconsultants.co.uk

### SHEFFIELD / SPRU

Ground Floor V1 Velocity Village Tenter Street Sheffield S1 4BY

Tel: 0114 228 9190 Fax: 0114 272 1947 sheffield@dlpconsultants.co.uk

# WILBRAHAM ASSOCIATES

RUGBY

18a Regent Place Rugby Warwickshire CV21 2PN

Tel: 01788 562 233

info@wilbrahamassociates.co.uk