

## Pendle Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Policies

### Appendix 1: Scoping Report and Methodology

#### Consultation Comments

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
C001SRM	00197	Highways England Mr Warren Hilton	<p>Thank you for inviting Highways England to comment upon the call for sites and Scoping Report &amp; Methodology in support of developing the 'Local Plan 2 - Site Allocations and Development Policies' for Pendle Borough. We note that the current call for sites is in support of identifying sites to deliver additional housing and employment need.</p> <p>The extent of Highways England's management of the M65 extends from Junction 1 to Junction 10, with Lancashire County Council assuming responsibility for the remaining junctions and carriageway. The primary junctions which would experience a direct impact as a consequence of any development within the Borough of Pendle would be Junctions 14, 13 and 12. Consequently, there will be no sites within the Borough that would be located directly adjacent to the strategic road network (SRN) that we operate and which could have a physical impact upon our SRN.</p> <p>The M65 west of Junction 10 suffers from peak time congestion at certain junctions, mainly caused by the variation in the number of lanes and the restricting capacity of one or two lane sections and the close proximity of junctions. Our assessment of the M65 SRN corridor has identified that parts of the network will operate at or approaching capacity in future years. Given this, it is important that, consistent with the Department for Transport Guidance and the DfT Circular 02/2013, Transport Assessments and Travel Plans are undertaken where any development is likely to have significant transport implications on the SRN.</p> <p>Against this background, our concern in relation to the emerging Local Plan 2 will be in understanding the quantum of additional traffic that the sites identified within the following draft Local Plan are likely to generate on the SRN and its junctions (M65 mainline west of Junction 10, including Junctions 8, 9 and 10) against the trajectory of the Plan period and the soon to be adopted Burnley Local Plan. We welcome the Council's commitment to producing highways evidence as set out in paragraph 5.48 of the Scoping Report &amp; Methodology. In this respect, we would advise that the development of this evidence base work is carried out in conjunction with Lancashire County Council.</p>	<p>The Council notes that no sites within the Borough will be located adjacent to the strategic road network (SRN) operated by Highways England.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>The impact that development sites in future iterations of the Local Plan may have on the highways network, both individually and cumulatively, will be carefully considered through the Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal processes before the final 'suite' of site allocations is finalised. We welcome the opportunity to use the VISSIM model to aid us in this work.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Contact Highways England about use of the VISSIM Model in assessing potential development sites.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>Any identified capacity issues must be addressed through the implementation of appropriate infrastructure improvements and / or mitigation measures to be agreed in liaison with Highways England (in so far as they being located on the SRN or on the local road network that could affect the operation of the SRN). In this sense, we would expect that any requirement for highways infrastructure improvements should be articulated for delivery at the appropriate time in the Local Plan operating period as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor and / or Growth Deal funding streams. However, we assume that capacity enhancement is identified as a last resort with focus upon sustainable locations, meaningful measures aimed at reducing trip generation and demand management.</p> <p>In terms of the SRN (M65 mainline and Junctions 8, 9 and 10), Highways England is in the process of developing a VISSIM traffic model of the M65 between Junctions 8 to 10 (including the surrounding local road network approaches to these junctions) within Burnley, which is expected to be completed during April 2017. Whilst this model has been developed to assist us in understanding and testing future road network improvements affecting the SRN being proposed by Lancashire County Council as part of the Burnley Local Plan, Highways England is ready to assist Pendle Borough Council and Lancashire County Council by providing the use of this model to assist the development of the Local Plan 2 highways evidence and understanding of its impacts upon the SRN. This is also important to Highways England, not just in terms of ensuring that appropriate improvements are able to feature within the Council's new Infrastructure Development Plan, but in helping us in the identification and development of future network enhancements through the government's second Roads Investment Strategy (2020-25) and beyond.</p>	<p>Several policies in LP1 seek to minimise the impact of new development on the highway network. Those most relevant to this objective include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy SDP2 directs development to the most sustainable locations within the borough, maximising the opportunity to use sustainable travel modes and public transport to access employment and leisure opportunities.</li> <li>• Policy ENV4 requires all new development to have regard to the potential impacts they may have on the highways network and major developments are required to submit a travel assessment and/or travel plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p>
C002SRM	00378	Mr Peter Wray	<p>PLEASE no more building in Fence/wheatley lane .With the development of the old mill and Harpers Inn site I feel that is enough for the village. The village is being ruined by all this development. The school is full and can take no more pupils.it is becoming a night mare trying to drive through the village before and after school times. Think of the people living here and the lives that are being ruined just to meet government targets. We know how many houses there are for sale in Nelson. think of the Every Street Area which was renovated at some cost and nobody living at any of the houses.</p>	<p>The respondent has requested no further development in the Fence/Wheatley Lane area, but has not put forward any evidence to justify why this is a reasonable position to take.</p> <p>In LP1, Policy SDP2 identifies Fence as one of four Rural Service Centres (RSCs) in Pendle. These villages provide a range of services (shops, services, schools, jobs etc.) for local residents and those living in the smaller rural villages within the immediate area. The RSCs are expected to provide the focus for the limited amount of growth in Rural Pendle – 12% for Housing (Policy SDP3) and 3% for Employment (Policy SDP4).</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
				<p>In the Scoping Report &amp; Methodology a balanced distribution (Table 3.10) translates this into a requirement for 87 new homes in Fence for the period 2011-2030. Completions since the start of the plan period (April 2011) and existing commitments (including Spring Mill and the former Harpers Inn site) are then removed from this total to give a residual requirement of 44 new homes up to the end of the plan period (2030). These houses are needed to address local needs (population growth and young people born in the village being able to continue to live in the village) and help to rebalance the housing market in Pendle, which has an over-reliance on outdated terraced properties.</p> <p>Nelson is a separate housing market and its own needs are dealt with in similar manner.</p> <p>With a residual requirement of just 4.35ha for the whole of the borough (Authority's Monitoring Report 2015/16), opportunities for employment development in the rural areas will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed. The proposed methodology for the allocation of development between individual settlements (LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology, Tables 3.10 and 3.11) is considered to be sound by Pendle Council and is supported in other representations. No alternative approach has been put forward for consideration.</b></p>
C003SRM	01406	Mr Brian Whittle	Can I again make two basic points. First the forecasted figures for new housing are wildly speculative and not evidenced based which applies nationally and ...	<p>The housing requirement has been calculated using modelling work commissioned from independent consultants. This uses the ONS Population Projections as its starting point, as required by the Government. The requirement of 5,662 new homes to be built in Pendle between 2011 and 2030 (298dpa) is established in LP1 Policy LIV1, which was subject to independent examination by an inspector appointed by the Secretary of state in April 2015 and found to be sound.</p> <p>Reconsideration of this figure is not appropriate in LP2, where the focus is on identifying where new homes should</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>... secondly the infrastructure is completely inadequate to take new development on this scale. Who will want to buy a house on the Peel site if they have to have traffic signals to get in and out at peak times and join a queue to get on to the junction 13 roundabout? It will ruin this part of Pendle. The same criticism applies to people living up at Fence when there is a junction with Lomesaye expansion. Nobody will take the slightest bit of notice so thank goodness I am not of a generation which will have to suffer.</p>	<p>be built to meet this requirement in the most sustainable manner.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>A rigorous site assessment process, as set-out in the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology (Chapter 5 and Appendix 1), and the statutory requirement to carry out Sustainability Appraisal of the plan (LP2) will ensure that the sites selected for allocation are in locations where the existing infrastructure is capable of accommodating the proposed level of development, or can be sufficiently upgraded through planning obligations attached to the relevant planning permission(s).</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p>
C004SRM	00344	Network Rail Ms Diane Clarke	<p><b>Pendle - Local Plan Part 2</b></p> <p><b>Pre-application – Standing Advice</b></p> <p>Network Rail is looking at how we can work smarter to help enable development near to the railway.</p> <p>(1)</p> <p>It has come to our attention that where applications have an impact on the railway network, in particular on level crossings, the application is delayed or is objectionable because negotiations with developers are not agreed before a Planning Application is submitted.</p> <p>I am sure you are aware that Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and for any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order); in addition you are required to consult the Office of Rail and Road (ORR).</p> <p>Where there is an adverse impact on the operation of the railway, Network</p>	<p>The respondent has presented standing advice, which will help to inform the preparation policies in the next iteration of the plan (LP2).</p> <p>The Council is fully aware of its statutory duties in relation to development in the vicinity of the national rail network. As this consultation response demonstrates, the Council is committed to meaningful engagement with Network Rail throughout the preparation of LP2, in order to seek its views on the proposed site allocations and policies.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>Rail will require appropriate mitigation measures to be delivered as part of the planning application process. By this stage in the process our request for further information such as a Transport Assessment (to provide detail of the suspected impact) and where necessary, the provision of planning obligations can cause significant delay. This can be highly frustrating for any developer who has undertaken pre-application advice, and invested time and money, in working through mitigation measures including Heads of Terms for Section 106 agreements.</p> <p>To help alleviate this problem it is requested that you add a standard paragraph to any pre- application response you provide. I have put together a paragraph which if included as general advice, may help avoid any disruption further along the process.</p> <p><i>Should your development be likely to increase the level of pedestrian and / or vehicular usage at a level crossing any future planning application should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact. Any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed should be included within the Heads of Terms.</i></p> <p>(2)</p> <p>Within Transport Assessment's there is a review of local needs regarding public transport; this usually focuses on buses. However, Transport Assessments should also take into account their impact upon footfall at railway stations. Developers are encouraged to consider including within Transport Assessments trip generation data at railway stations. Location of the proposal, accessibility and density of the development should be considered in relation to the relevant railway station in the area.</p> <p>Where proposals are likely to increase footfall at railway stations the Local Planning Authority should consider a developer contribution (either via CIL, S106 or unilateral undertaking) to provide funding for enhancements as stations as a result of increased numbers of customers.</p>	<p>Where appropriate, policies will require developers to contribute (through CIL, if adopted, or S106 agreements attached to a planning permission) to the cost of upgrading local infrastructure where this is necessary "to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms." The land itself, rather than the person or organisation that develops the land, is legally bound by such an agreement, something any future owners will need to take into account.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Relevant policies to consider contributions towards transport infrastructure improvements including railways.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
C005SRM	00191	Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Mr John Moran	<p>Thank you for your request to provide a representation on the above consultation document.</p> <p>When consulted on land use planning matters, HSE where possible will make representations to ensure that compatible development within the consultation zones of major hazard establishments and major accident hazard pipelines (MAHPs) is achieved.</p> <p>We have concluded that we have no representation to make at this stage of your local planning process. This is because there is insufficient information in the consultation document on the location and use class of sites that could be developed. In the absence of this information, HSE is unable to give advice regarding the compatibility of future developments within the consultation zones of major hazard establishments and MAHPs located in the area of your local plan.</p> <p>Planning authorities are advised to use HSE's Planning Advice Web App to verify any advice given. The Web App is a software version of the methodology used in providing land use planning advice. It replaces PADHI+. Please see the advice note below for further information on the Web App including accessing the package.</p> <p><b>Future Consultation with HSE on Local Plans</b></p> <p>HSE acknowledges that early consultation can be an effective way of alleviating problems due to incompatible development at the later stages of the planning process, and that we may be able to provide advice on development compatibility as your plan progresses. Therefore, we would like to be consulted further on local plan documents where detailed land allocations and use class proposals are made; e.g. site specific allocations of land in development planning documents.</p>	<p>As this consultation response demonstrates, the Council is committed to meaningful engagement with the Health &amp; Safety Executive throughout the preparation of LP2, in order to seek its views on the proposed site allocations and policies.</p> <p>The next iteration of the plan (the LP2 Preferred Options Report) will clearly articulate the location and proposed use of those sites it is recommending are allocated for development in the plan period (i.e. up to 2030).</p> <p>As requested, where appropriate the HSE Planning Advice web app will be used to help verify information.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted.</b></p>
C006SRM	00198	Historic England Ms Emily Hrycan	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above. This response details the expectations of the Local Plan for Pendle (Part 2) and the historic environment.</p> <p>Historic England is the Government's statutory advisor on all matters relating to the historic environment in England. We are a non-departmental public body established under the National Heritage Act 1983 and sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). We champion and protect</p>	<p>The respondent has presented standing advice, which will help to inform both the preparation policies and the allocation of sites in the next iteration of LP2.</p> <p>Several of the points raised have already been addressed in LP1 Core Strategy, which was adopted by Pendle Council in December 2015. Those most relevant to this representation include:</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>England's historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly understood, enjoyed and cared for.</p> <p>Historic England has produced a number of good practice advice notes on the historic environment, in particular the Good Practice Advice Note on the Historic Environment and Local Plans (<a href="http://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plns/">http://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plns/</a>), which provides supporting information on good practice in plan-making, and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (<a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/</a>) may be useful in the production of your plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan for Pendle will be expected to include a proper description, identification and assessment of the historic environment and the supporting evidence base is expected to include heritage information. The Plan will need to demonstrate how it conserves and enhances the historic environment of the area and guide how the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied locally. This includes ensuring that the sites which it is proposing to put forward for development, will assist in delivering such a strategy.</p> <p><b>Evidence Base</b></p> <p>A sound local plan should be based on an up-to-date evidence base which includes reference to the historic environment. The evidence base needs to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What contribution the historic environment makes to the character of the area, to its economic well-being and to the quality of life of its communities;</li> <li>• What issues and challenges is it facing and likely to be facing in the future;</li> <li>• What opportunities the historic environment offers for helping to deliver the other objectives in the Plan area.</li> </ul> <p>When undertaking this exercise, it is important to bear in mind that it is not</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Spatial Portrait, which fully acknowledges the quality and importance of the natural and historic environment in Pendle.</li> <li>• Policy ENV1, which seeks to protect and, where possible enhance, the most important features of the natural and historic environment in Pendle.</li> <li>• Policy ENV2, which seeks to achieve quality in design and conservation</li> <li>• Policies WRK4, WRK5 and SUP4 which recognise the importance of the natural and historic environment to quality of life and the local economy and in particular for town centres, tourism and the public realm.</li> </ul> <p>LP2, together with any emerging Neighbourhood Plans, will provide additional detail to assist planning officers with the interpretation of these strategic policies at a local level.</p> <p>A rigorous site assessment process, as set-out in the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology (Chapter 5 and Appendix 1), and the statutory requirement to carry out Sustainability Appraisal of the plan (LP2) will ensure that both the policies and sites allocations in LP2 have fully considered their impact on the historic environment and local distinctiveness and, where necessary, have taken account of any cross-boundary implications.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted.</b></p> <p>The borough contains 23 conservation areas 11 scheduled monuments and over 300 listed buildings. Most of the borough's 23 conservation areas have detailed up-to-date appraisals highlighting the importance of the heritage assets they contain, within the context of the wider historic environment. These documents are available online for use by developers.</p> <p>Site assessment criterion 3.18 (LP2 Scoping Report Appendix 1) considers the potential impact on heritage assets, but does not rely on distance to determine the potential level of harm.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>simply an exercise in listing known sites but, rather understanding their value to society (i.e. their significance). There is a need to identify the subtle qualities of the area and its local distinctiveness and character which can easily be lost. There will need to be an assessment of the likelihood of currently unidentified heritage assets including sites of historic and archaeological interest being discovered in the future. It may also be necessary to identify heritage assets outside the Council's area where there are likely to be setting impacts caused by any development proposals put forward in the area. It is also important to bear in mind that some asset types are not currently well recorded. For example, the Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest in England, is thought to represent only around two thirds of sites potentially deserving inclusion. Evidence gathering can also help to identify part of a locality that may be worthy of designation as a conservation area and identify assets that are worthy of inclusion in a local list.</p> <p>Potential sources of evidence include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Heritage List for England</li> <li>• Historic Environment Record</li> <li>• Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans</li> <li>• Local Lists</li> <li>• National and Local Heritage At Risk Registers</li> <li>• Historic Characterisation Assessments</li> <li>• World Heritage Site Management Plans</li> <li>• In house and local knowledge expertise</li> </ul> <p>Where the evidence base is weak, the Council will need to commission additional work to ensure that the historic environment is adequately dealt with and can be used to inform the Plan.</p> <p><b>Spatial Portraits</b></p> <p>The Local Plan should include a proper description and assessment of the historic environment in the Borough and the contribution it makes to the area (NPPF, Paragraph 169). The Plan needs to describe the historical growth of the area and identify its historic environment. It should also clearly identify the different places their character and identity and the contribution it makes to all aspects of life in Pendle.</p> <p><b>Local Pan Policies</b></p>	<b>ACTION: Comments noted.</b>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>One of the twelve principle objectives of planning under the NPPF is the conservation of heritage assets for the quality of life they bring to this and future generations (NPPF, Paragraph 17). Conservation means maintaining what is important about a place and improving this where it is desirable. It is not a passive exercise. It requires a Plan for the maintenance and use of heritage assets and for the delivery of development within their setting that will make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>Conservation is not a standalone exercise satisfied by standalone policies that repeat the NPPF objectives. The Local Plan should also consider the role which the historic environment can play in delivering other planning objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building a strong, competitive economy</li> <li>• Ensuring the vitality of town centres</li> <li>• Supporting a prosperous rural economy</li> <li>• Promoting sustainable transport</li> <li>• Supporting high quality communication infrastructure</li> <li>• Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes</li> <li>• Requiring good design</li> <li>• Protecting green belt land</li> <li>• Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change</li> <li>• Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</li> <li>• Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals</li> </ul> <p>In formulating the strategy it is advisable and often necessary to consider the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the historic environment can assist in the delivery of the vision and the economic, social and environmental objectives for the plan areas;</li> <li>• How the Plan will address particular issues identified during the development of the evidence base including heritage at risk;</li> <li>• The interrelationship between conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and the other Plans policies and objectives;</li> <li>• The means by which development in conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets might enhance or better reveal their significance;</li> <li>• How local lists might assist in identifying and managing the conservation on non-designated heritage assets;</li> <li>• How the archaeology of the Plan area might be managed;</li> </ul>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How CIL funding might contribute towards ensuring a sustainable future for individual assets or specific historic places and whether or not certain heritage assets might need to be identified;</li> <li>• Whether implementation partners need to be identified in order to deliver the positive strategy;</li> <li>• What indicators should be used to monitor the effectiveness of the strategy.</li> </ul> <p><u>Development Management Policies</u> In terms of development management policies, it is clear that the NPPF expects plans to include detailed policies, which will enable a decision maker to determine a planning application.</p> <p>The Local Plan for Pendle should include specific policies for the historic environment in order to help inform decisions that affect it and others should where possible cross-reference heritage related issues.</p> <p>Key issues to be considered are (not wholly comprehensive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undesignated heritage assets (including significance of, setting, extensions, demolition, alterations change of use, etc).</li> <li>• Designated heritage assets (including significance of, setting, extensions, demolition, alterations, change of use, etc).</li> <li>• Archaeology including remains of less than national importance.</li> <li>• Conservation areas</li> <li>• Registered parks and gardens</li> <li>• Heritage at Risk</li> <li>• Important views and vistas</li> <li>• Landscape character</li> <li>• Local character and distinctiveness</li> <li>• Individual settlements</li> <li>• Historic shopfronts and advertisements</li> <li>• Public realm</li> <li>• Design</li> <li>• Information to accompany an application.</li> </ul> <p><u>Strategic Cross Boundary Issues</u> Strategic cross boundary issues that affect the historic environment are issues that can only be effectively addressed at a larger than local scale and may</p>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>cover the issues listed below, this is not an exclusive list and strategic issues will have to be considered on an area by area basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• extensive designated and non-designated heritage assets, e.g. World Heritage Sites, historic landscapes,</li> <li>• major heritage based tourism attractions, the management of which may impact upon more than one Authority</li> <li>• major quarries for building and roofing stone, e.g. Portland stone</li> <li>• major changes to green belt which affect the preservation of the setting and character of historic towns</li> <li>• major development proposals likely to affect important heritage assets in a neighbouring authority, e.g. major urban extensions, infrastructure proposals.</li> </ul> <p>These strategic issues will not necessarily and always be the same as the strategic policies for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment included in a Local Plan but are likely to be a sub-set of them. Indeed local circumstances may indicate that strategic approaches may not always be needed. The sustainability appraisal scoping report should help to identify what is important for a particular plan area.</p> <p><b>Site Allocations</b></p> <p>The NPPF makes it clear that the significance of heritage assets can be harmed through development within their setting. There is a requirement in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that ‘special regard’ should be had to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest they possess. It is also the duty of the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its conservation areas and their setting. Where potential development sites appear to include non-designated assets including the possibility for archaeology, their potential should be investigated and retention/exploration should be promoted.</p> <p>Consequently, before allocating any site there would need to be evaluation of the impact, which the development might have upon those elements that contribute to the significance of a heritage asset including their setting, through undertaking a heritage impact assessment. The assessment of the sites needs to address the central issue of whether or not the <u>principle</u> of development and loss of any open space is acceptable. The use of distance</p>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>only as a way to determine the impact should be avoided. It needs to evaluate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What contribution the site in its current form makes to those elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage assets. For a number of these heritage assets, it might be the case that the site makes very little or no contribution.</li> <li>2. What impact the loss of the area and its subsequent development might have upon those elements which contribute to the significance of those heritage assets.</li> <li>3. If it is likely to result in harm, how might that harm be removed or reduced to an acceptable level.</li> <li>4. If the harm cannot be reduced or removed, what are the public benefits that outweigh the presumption in favour of the conservation of the heritage assets?</li> </ol> <p>The selection of sites for development needs to be informed by an up-to-date evidence base and the Plan should avoid allocating those sites which are likely result in harm to the significance of the heritage assets of the Plan area. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, the Plan should consider how any harm might be mitigated. This could include measures such as a reduction of quantum of development within another part of the site allocation. Such initiative need to be fully justified and evidenced to ensure that such measures are successful in reducing identified harm.</p> <p>The allocation of sites for development may also present better opportunities for the historic environment. For example, new development may better reveal the significance of heritage assets or may provide an opportunity to tackle heritage at risk.</p> <p>Where relevant, policies for allocated sites may need to make reference to identified historic environment attributes in order to guide how development should be delivered. For example, this might require the policy to include detailed criteria or providing supplementary information with the supporting text.</p> <p>Historic England strongly advises that you engage conservation, archaeology and urban design colleagues at the Council to ensure that you are aware of all the relevant features of the historic environment and that the historic environment is effectively and efficiently considered in the development management policies, in the allocation of any site and in the preparation of</p>	<p>The Council's Principal Conservation Officer is an integral part of the team preparing LP2.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			the SEA. They are also best placed to advise on local historic environment issues and priorities, including access to data held on the HER. This will ensure that there is a joined up and robust approach is undertaken to historic environment issues.	
C007SRM	01493	Jane & Jeffrey Gibson	<p>In response to the public consultation on Pendle Local Plan Part 2 we would like to comment after looking through the planning and areas which are highlighted for future development for housing in and around Barrowford, Nelson, Colne and Barnoldswick. Many of these areas do not take into consideration many of the brown field sites which are available and which are nearer to towns and accessible to public amenities and transport networks. Nelson has several brownfield sites set within the town which are not being utilised which could be used for housing e.g. properties such as shops which have space above them which could be used for accommodation, property within the town as in Market Street which are empty and boarded up, space above hotels in Nelson that is unused and is ideally located for the transport hub. The old bus station voted one of the biggest eyesores in the area and car park above is surely ideal for redevelopment. There is no need for vast housing developments that sprawl into the countryside and eat up land that will be needed by future generations for agriculture and livestock. The only reason that these sites are being considered is for the necessity for the gain of the council by charging higher valuation bands for council tax which does not help first time buyers or people on low incomes.</p> <p>If the developments are to go ahead surely the boundaries between towns would be lost as each one eats into the other e.g. Barnoldwsick, Salterforth,</p>	<p>The long-list of sites under consideration for allocation in LP2 includes both Greenfield and Brownfield sites. Three separate 'Call for Sites' consultations have been held between 2007 and 2017 to help identify those sites within the borough that in terms of their development potential are considered to be available, suitable and achievable within the plan period (i.e. 2011-2030).</p> <p>Detailed site assessment work, guided by the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology will determine whether these assertions are considered to be correct and if the sites themselves can be regarded as sustainable locations for future development.</p> <p>Only those sites that help to meet the identified development needs of the borough, in terms of both the overall amount and within particular locations, will be allocated in LP2.</p> <p>Many of the Brownfield sites that have not been identified through this process remain in use, and the owners are not willing to consider their redevelopment during the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>Living above the shop can be achieved through permitted development and does not require a policy stance.</p> <p>Planning policy cannot force owners to use the upper floors of their premises for residential purposes, although this can be incentivised in other ways (e.g. through the provision of grant funding, if available).</p> <p><b>Action: Comments noted.</b></p> <p>The Council is not proposing to facilitate the merger of settlements, but instead is seeking to adopt a strategy that</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>Kelbrook becoming Barforthbrook Newtown!</p> <p>We also think why does all housing have to be a sprawl, why not build up. Not giant skyscrapers but maisonettes with parking underneath and landscaped. On a recent visit to the Blackpool area there are vast areas that are being redeveloped but the infrastructure cannot cope and the roads around these areas are gridlocked by the traffic.</p> <p>Throughout the country doubt is being raised with regard to the accuracy of the figures that have been quoted on the amount of housing and development that will be needed and many protests taking place as in Manchester recently by people concerned at the loss of green space essential for mental and physical well being of people. The parks in London were planted by a generation 200 years ago who knew the significance of this environment and the need for green space. They were the custodians of their time and they got it right we need to do the same as they did.</p>	<p>will help to promote local distinctiveness, which will help to retain the unique character and identity of settlements in the borough.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The housing requirement has been calculated using modelling work commissioned from independent consultants. This uses the ONS Population Projections as its starting point, as required by the Government. The requirement of 5,662 new homes to be built in Pendle between 2011 and 2030 (298dpa) is established in LP1 Policy LIV1, which was subject to independent examination by an inspector appointed by the Secretary of state in April 2015 and found to be sound.</p> <p>Reconsideration of this figure is not appropriate in LP2, where the focus is on identifying where new homes should be built to meet this requirement in the most sustainable manner.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p>
C008SRM	00250	CPRE Lancashire Ms Jackie Copley	<p>1. The Lancashire Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England is writing in response to the Local Plan consultation on Call for Sites, Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Policies - Scoping Report and Methodology, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for Local Plan Part 2, and the Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>2. The Campaign to Protect Rural England exists to promote the beauty, tranquillity and diversity of rural England by encouraging the sustainable use of land and other natural resources in town and country. We promote positive solutions for the long-term future of the countryside to ensure change values its natural and built environment.</p> <p>3. Pendle is a diverse place, with most of its people living in the four urban settlements of Nelson, Colne, Brierfield and Barrowford in the south of the borough or Barnoldswick and Earby to the north. However the</p>	<p>The Inspector's Report for LP1 Core Strategy at paragraphs 38 and 39 makes clear that the sequential approach is no longer part of Government policy.</p> <p>LP1 Policy SDP2 includes the criteria for the selection of sites for new development. At the request of the Inspector it was amended to encourage the re-use of previously developed land, but also to make clear that it cannot be a priority. The policy also makes clear that Greenfield sites should be in sustainable locations and well related to existing settlements.</p> <p>This is compliant with the NPPF requirement (para 17) to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (Brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>majority of the area is rural in character with one-third of the borough of open countryside is protected by international, national or local environmental designations, so CPRE's Lancashire Branch believes it is important for the Core Strategy to contain appropriate policies that best protect and enhance the countryside for the population of Pendle now and in the future.</p> <p>4. CPRE Lancashire supported the inclusion of Pendle Hill, the picturesque millstone fell in isolated grandeur, in the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and we place high value on the landscapes afforded by the peaks of Weets and Boulsworth. The gently rolling landscapes offer some of the most interesting and attractive villages in Lancashire and forms an important part of Lancashire's history and cultural identity with folklore include witchcraft, the Leeds and Liverpool Canal provides rich industrial heritage, and literary connections to the Bronte sisters with the isolated hamlet of Wycoller. These heritage assets including the rural landscapes within which they are located ought to be safeguarded for continued benefit of residents and the value of the growing tourism sector of the area.</p> <p><b>Call for Sites and Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Policies - Scoping Report and Methodology</b></p> <p>5. We recommend the Council steers development to vacant and underused previously developed (brownfield) sites in advance of allocating land in the countryside. The over allocation of greenfield sites will undermine the market for brownfield sites and cause 'needless' loss of farmland, habitat and our beloved countryside.</p> <p>6. We believe it is crucial that a sequential test is applied to the selection of local plan sites, in conjunction with a brownfield development target to make the local plan as effective at recycling land as possible. First target brownfield land in urban places, then look to sustainable urban extensions on the most sustainable land, taking into account visual harm, biodiversity, public transport services etc.</p> <p>7. We believe the Council should use a brownfield register to record 'suitable' sites and also refer to the most recent National Land Use Database that recorded 'all sites available.'</p>	<p>NPPF (Para 173) requires plans to pay careful attention to viability. In the short-term many Brownfield sites in Pendle will not be viable. Therefore, to ensure the delivery of the housing requirement, Pendle Council will be required to bring forward some development on Greenfield sites.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><b>Housing White Paper and the Scale of Development Identified</b></p> <p>12. CPRE Lancashire has been engaging with the Government on the new Housing White Paper. It is clear honest methods of identifying the objectively assessed needs are needed to stop the artificial increasing of targets by local plans.</p> <p>13. The housing figures are much higher than the North West Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 which identified a figure of 190 per annum (total 3,420). Given the spatial portrait states there was a recent slow growth trend, even accepting the demographic structure with younger age cohorts and impacts of migration, CPRE Lancashire views this housing figure as too high. But, we do not wish to incur any delay in the Council adopting a Local Plan as this policy void renders Pendle vulnerable to speculative housing developments in the countryside.</p> <p>14. CPRE Lancashire believes the level of new housing should ensure that the needs and demands for housing are met (i.e. it will meet the objectively assessed needs for housing in the Borough), address the likely population and household growth and cater for the predicted level of economic growth to ensure the Local Plan can be found sound at Examination to aid its adoption at the earliest possible time.</p> <p>15. We do genuinely welcome the change in direction of the government's planning policies as set out in the White Paper. However, we see some aspects, which give us concern.</p> <p>16. We are especially worried that it fails to give Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) adequate powers to ensure that developers build out their planning consents on a timescale which allows LPAs to remain compliant with the 5-Year Housing Supply (5YHLS) Rule and so avoid the damaging consequences of failing to satisfy the rule. Our comment to the Housing White Paper are as follows, which could aid the development of local plan policy in Pendle:</p> <p>17. Given that it is the developers who build the houses, not the LPAs, we believe that the planning consent should specify the phasing of the build-out in time intervals appropriate to site circumstances over the entirety of the delivery of the consent.</p>	<p>The housing requirement – 5,662 new homes to be built in Pendle between 2011 and 2030 (298dpa) – is established in LP1 Policy LIV1. As noted by the respondent this figure meets the objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing in the Borough and caters for the predicted level of economic growth. LP1 was subject to independent examination by an inspector appointed by the Secretary of state in April 2015 and found to be sound.</p> <p>Reconsideration of this figure is not appropriate in LP2, where the focus is on identifying where new homes should be built to meet this requirement in the most sustainable manner.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Pendle Council notes the concerns of the CPRE with regard to the content of the Housing White Paper, but this is not a matter for consideration as part of this consultation exercise.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>18. The first phase would have a duration appropriate for the preparation of the site and incorporation of necessary infrastructure (roads, utilities, etc); for a very large site or a highly contaminated brownfield site, this might be as long as 3 years, but one or two years would be more usual depending on the size of the site. Subsequent phases would have durations appropriate to the number of units to be completed, typically three years, until the consent is fully delivered.</p> <p>19. If at the end of each phase progress were unsatisfactory and the developer was unable to provide an acceptable explanation for the delay, the LPA would be empowered to exercise an appropriate sanction. Possible sanctions are specified in section 2.39 of the HWP, and we believe that others are possible, but we shall not specify them in this short note; the ultimate sanction would be withdrawal of the planning consent.</p> <p>20. Throughout the entire duration of the build-out, the land associated with the development would remain in the estimate of the housing land supply. At present, if the consent refers to a large number of units, after five years the land associated with the unbuilt units is excluded from the estimate of the housing land supply. Thus, in order to remain compliant with the 5YHLS rule, the LPA must allocate the equivalent amount of land, often putting at risk the unnecessary development of further greenfield or Green Belt land.</p> <p>21. We regard it as essential that LPAs are empowered to stop what we see as this irrational process. We believe that LPAs, if they are really do what we all want, must be given the resources required to implement this oversight.</p> <p>22. Much more could be said about the control that this form of phasing gives to LPAs. It has the merit of flexibility and takes account of the interests of large-scale developers who are not trying to game the system (land banking, controlling development rates to maintain house prices) while at the same time makes LPAs accountable for delivery in a fair way.</p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>23. We trust that Pendle Council in so far as the National Planning Policy Framework allows will adopt a Core Strategy and Site Allocations and</p>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			Development Policies that enables urban locations to be revitalised and the rural places protected for the benefit of people today and in the future.	
C009SRM	00528	Dickman Associates Ltd Ms Jane Dickman On behalf of Trustees of the Green Emmott Trust	<p>The proposed methodology not unexpectedly basically follows that used by other councils and is broadly supported.</p> <p><b>Para 3.15</b> - identifies the areas in greatest need of affordable homes with almost 70% being in the M65 corridor yet the Core Strategy makes no affordable provision on new sites in this area. This seems to be a direct opposite of the areas identified for making a contribution to affordable housing in the CS. A factor we raised at the time of those consultations.</p> <p><b>Table 3.10</b> – we concur with the proposed spatial distribution that Laneshawbridge should be 8% of the rural villages figure. We concur with the summary comments but feel these should also note that the village has potential to grow given the good transport links, easy access to Colne and the fact the primary school has recently been extended. As the Housing White Paper 2017 (HWP17) says identifying opportunities for villages to thrive.</p> <p><b>Para 5.3</b> – Site Size Thresholds – these should be in line with the criteria that the HWP17 proposes when it becomes an Act so that flexibility needs to be accommodated in the document wording.</p> <p><b>Para 5.36</b> – we concur that greenfield development sites need to be in</p>	<p>Whilst evidence in the Burnley &amp; Pendle Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates that the greatest need for affordable housing is in the M65 Corridor, the lack of viability in this spatial area means that the Council cannot ask for contributions from developers at this time.</p> <p>The Inspector's Report for LP1 (Core Strategy) at paragraph 78 highlights the need for an early partial review of the plan to review viability and the possibility of introducing a requirement for affordable housing contributions for developments in the M65 Corridor.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted. The preparation of LP2 provides an opportunity to update the Pendle Development Viability Study (DVS) and reassess the contribution that new development can make to affordable housing requirements in the borough.</b></p> <p>The good transport links, access to Colne and increased capacity of the school in Laneshaw Bridge will be acknowledged within the description in Table 3.10. However, the representation acknowledges the proposed distribution of housing for the village (8%) is considered to be appropriate. As this figure is expressed as a minimum, the potential for additional sustainable growth, is not restricted.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Update Table 3.10 in the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology as indicated above..</b></p> <p>The Council agrees with the respondent on this matter.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Site Size Thresholds in LP2 to accord with the legislative requirements / national policy requirements and guidelines.</b></p> <p>The Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal process</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>sustainable locations and well related to existing settlements hence promoting our clients' site at Emmott Lane which meets these criteria.</p> <p><b>Chapter 7</b> - looks at the review of the Green Belt Boundaries and we note that the Green Belt assessment does not propose any amendments to the Green Belt boundaries in the Laneshawbridge area so they will be retained.</p> <p><b>Para 10.4</b> – The timetable has not been updated and also does not match the one in the SA.</p>	<p>will determine whether the site at Emmott Lane in Laneshaw Bridge is sustainable. A decision will then be made as to whether it is appropriate to allocate this site as part of the Council's development strategy for the Borough.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The timetable in the Sustainability Appraisal report is the most up to date. However, the 'official' timetable will be shown in an updated Local Development Scheme.</p> <p><b>ACTION: The Local Development Scheme (LDS) to be revised when the timescales for plan preparation have been firmly established following this initial informal consultation period.</b></p>
C010SRM	00258	Lancashire County Council Mr Marcus Hudson	<p>Thank you for inviting views on the above document. Please find below the comments and recommendations that have emerged from the Scoping Report and Methodology.</p> <p><b>2. Scoping of Development Management Policies</b>  <b>Recommendation:</b> LCC Public Health and Wellbeing would like to be actively engaged in the drafting of Policy SUP6 Supporting Healthy Lifestyles, which will include setting out a range of measures that will help improve the health of people in the borough. As stated in the Policy Description, the policy could include reference to improving access to open space and addressing the location of hot food takeaways. Consideration when drafting this policy should also be given to the possible inclusion of measures to improve active travel, air quality, road safety, child poverty, healthy settings design guidance and the use of Health Impact Assessments.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> LCC Public Health and Wellbeing would like to provide input into the preparation of Environment policies which can aid health and wellbeing through opportunities to improve physical activity and access to nature, including Policy ENV15 Green Infrastructure. LCC Public Health input can also be provided with regard to health infrastructure provision as per Policies SDP8 Developer Contributions and SUP5 Community Site Allocations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> LCC Public Health and Wellbeing would like to be involved in considering how the proposed housing policies LIV6-LIV13 can be used as</p>	<p>Pendle Council is happy to draw on the expertise of the LCC Public Health &amp; Wellbeing team to help prepare detailed planning policies that are appropriate, fully evidenced and compatible with other local planning authorities in the sub-region.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted. PBC to approach the LCC Public Health &amp; Wellbeing team at key stages in the plan preparation process.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>health planning interventions, with the aim of reducing health inequalities in the most deprived areas of the borough, by facilitating urban regeneration through housing development. In particular the policies need to be drafted in order to meet identified housing needs related to property type, size, tenure and affordability.</p> <p>Within the Pendle Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy, the Key Diagram shows the location of Housing Regeneration Areas and in the Housing Distribution section at paragraph 7.29 refers to regeneration work in part of Brierfield, Nelson and Colne. In the section Empty Homes, regeneration and land type at paragraph 10.50, a number of key regeneration projects are referenced and the ongoing production of Area Action Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents for some of the Housing Regeneration Priority Areas. Core Strategy Policy LIV1 Housing Provision and Delivery, provides some guidance on development proposals within or adjacent to a Housing Regeneration Priority Area. Footnote 110, names five key Housing Regeneration Priority Areas and states that other regeneration priority areas may be identified in the Pendle Local Plan Part 2 Site Allocations and Development Policies.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Housing Regeneration Areas are to be shown on the policies map. To accompany the identification of Housing Regeneration Areas on the policies map, LCC Public Health and Wellbeing recommend that a policy is also provided on the Housing Regeneration Areas to provide further detail to that contained within Core Strategy Policy LIV1. Further detail would include development criteria for those areas not subject to separate adopted Area Action Plans and Supplementary Planning Document and if applicable information of new Housing Regeneration Areas.</p> <p><b>5. Site Allocations</b></p> <p><b>Stage 4 Technical Appraisal of Short-listed Sites</b> The potential health impacts of the emerging Pendle Local Plan Part 2, policies and site allocations will be considered and appraised through the production of an accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). These potential health impacts will be considered as SA Objectives from Key Sustainability Issues for topics on Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure; Population and Community; Health and Wellbeing; Transport and Accessibility and Air Quality.</p>	<p>Pendle Council does not intend to identify specific Housing Regeneration Areas on the Policies Map. This will ensure a flexible approach to housing regeneration and renewal within the inner urban areas. As such a separate policy is considered to be inappropriate, rather proposed developments will be expected to draw on elements of policy support from the range of planning policies that have been identified. Where necessary, area specific SPDs (e.g. Railway Street, Brierfield SPD) will be prepared to help guide regeneration activity.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Health and Wellbeing is a cross-cutting theme addressed by questions under several headings within the appraisal process (Appendix 1). However, the Council agrees that for transparency it would be useful to list Health and Wellbeing separately within Table 5.1 and that the key issues for consideration should correspond with those</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>The Pendle Local Plan Part 2 Scoping Report and Methodology states that the Council will adopt an eight stage process for the assessment of sites, as shown in Figure 8 on Page 57. For Stage 4 of the site assessment process, a Technical appraisal of the short-listed sites will be conducted. The appraisal of the individual sites will require data to be gathered from a wide variety of sources, which will be obtained from people with specialist knowledge. Paragraph 5.40 states that the assessment work will focus on nine criteria as shown in Figure 5.2 – Highways, Drainage and Flood Risk, Heritage, Wildlife &amp; Ecology, Trees &amp; Woodland, Landscape, Open Space &amp; Green Infrastructure and Utilities. Following Stage 4, Stage 5 will be a public consultation on the initial list of options by settlement.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Given that the allocation of sites for development has the potential for significant health impacts, and that a range of Sustainability Appraisal topic areas contain topics with potential health impacts and sustainability issues, LCC Public Health and Wellbeing recommend that Health is added to the list of criteria for the Technical Appraisal of the shortlisted sites in Stage 4 of the assessment of sites process. Key issues for consideration at the Technical Appraisal regarding Health should correspond with those identified in the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan Part 2, i.e. Key Sustainability Issues, Objectives and Guide Questions with a health and wellbeing focus. External Contacts for Health will be Public Health England, NHS England, Lancashire County Council (Public Health) and East Lancashire Clinical Commissioning Group.</p> <p><b>Table 5.1 Criteria for initial site assessment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Table 5.1 under Highways, the sustainability of the site should be mentioned as one of the Key Issues/Criteria for initial site assessment. In Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Promoting Sustainable Transport, there is an emphasis on the developer/Local Planning Authority considering whether or not the site is in a sustainable location. Paragraph 34 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that <i>“plans and decisions should ensure that developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised”</i>. Whilst there is a caveat for rural areas, the sustainability of the site from a transport perspective should be adopted as one of the criteria for the initial site assessment. The Highways Authority would therefore be looking at the availability and proximity of local essential services such as education, retail and employment which would reduce the need to travel by car. This would</p>	<p>identified in the Sustainability Appraisal. The external contacts will be Public Health England, NHS England, Lancashire County Council (Public Health) and East Lancashire Clinical Commissioning Group.</p> <p><b>ACTION: The LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology to be revised to identify Health and Wellbeing in Table 5.1.</b></p> <p>The sustainability of a site is not measured by a single factor, but a combination of many factors as noted in the representation – i.e. the availability and proximity of essential services (such as education, retail and employment) which reduce the need to travel by car, the potential to travel by public transport etc. These factors are already addressed within the site appraisal criteria (Appendix 1) so a reference within Table 5.1 although not essential is considered appropriate.</p> <p><b>ACTION: The Council agrees with the respondent as these factors are already addressed by the site appraisal criteria (Appendix 1). A reference within Table 5.1 although not</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>also include the potential to travel by public transport. The sustainability credentials of a potential site would be applicable to both residential and employment uses.</p> <p><b>Figure 5.1 and Stage 7 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) &amp; Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)</b></p> <p>Figure 5.1 Summary of Key Stages in Site Assessment illustrates that at Stage 7 of the site assessment process, a SA &amp; HRA will be undertaken. Paragraph 5.53 states that and SA is an iterative process which influences all stages in the site selection process and that the early stages of the SA work will focus on scoping work to ensure that the criteria and impact tests for the Technical Appraisal (Stage 4) are appropriate. It also states that a full SA will only be undertaken at Stage 7 for those sites that are proposed for allocation in the Preferred Options Report, which will then be subject to public consultation at Stage 8.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is important that the SA is undertaken throughout the process of site assessment, in order for potential impacts, including potential health and wellbeing impacts, to be fully explored. It is therefore recommended that Figure 5.1 Summary of Key Stages in Site Assessment is amended to reflect that the SA process takes place at Stage 4 Technical Appraisal as well as at Stage 7.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Stage 4 Technical Appraisal should include Health as a focus and it is recommended that the Key Sustainability Issues, Objectives and Guide Questions relating to Health are considered as part of the process for the technical appraisal. This will ensure that health is fully considered with regard to sites identified prior to the public consultation at Stage 5 of the site assessment process. In addition, consideration of health and wellbeing potential impacts at Stage 4, will help to identify the key sustainability issues/appraisal criteria that should be explored in more detail as part of the full SA of short-listed sites at Stage 7 of the site assessment process.</p> <p>I trust that the comments outlined in this response are useful and I look forward to continuing our close work as the Pendle Local Plan Part 2 progresses.</p>	<p><b>essential, it is considered appropriate that under Highways, the sustainability of the site should be mentioned as one of the Key Issues/Criteria for initial site assessment.</b></p> <p>Whilst acknowledging that the representation is correct in highlighting that SA is an iterative process, which is carried out throughout the plan making process, this fact is already noted in paragraph 5.54 of the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology,</p> <p>Figure 5.1 is only intended to highlight the key stages in site assessment for a non-technical audience. So whilst the SA process starts at Stage 2, with the initial screening of sites, it is at Stage 7 that SA has its greatest impact. At this point the potential site allocations and their cumulative impacts are considered in detail the full SA Report is completed and published.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted, but no changes are proposed in order to maintain the clarity of Figure 5.1 for a non-technical audience.</b></p>
C011SRM	00439	Roughlee Parish Council Ms Mary Reed	The above document was considered by Roughlee Parish Council at their meeting of 3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2017 and the following comments are put forward for your consideration.	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>1. It is noted that future site allocations will be made on the basis of the approved Core Strategy Policy SPD 2. This policy designates Roughlee and Crow Trees as a Rural Village where development will be primarily to meet local needs. The policy also states that new development will be sited within a defined settlement boundary. The Parish Council support this policy approach.</p> <p>2. In the table on page 37 of the Scoping Report it is suggested that Roughlee and Crow Trees should accommodate 3% of the Rural Housing requirement. The Parish Council agree with the justification put forward in the table and, in particular that the 3% figure would allow for the development of a limited amount of housing to meet local needs. They would point out, however, that the reference to three housing completions in the last 11 years may now be out of date.</p> <p>3. Table 3.11 of the Scoping Report shows that the 3% figure for the Parish area equates to 17 houses over the plan period but shows only 2 have subsequently been completed or committed, giving a net requirement of 15 houses. The Parish Council are aware of a further 5 commitments which reduces the requirement to some 10 houses. They are also aware of other pending proposals.</p> <p>4. At the present time the Parish has two separate settlement boundaries, Roughlee and Crow Trees. The Parish Council's main comment is that these two separate boundaries should be maintained. They are aware that a possible development site, reference P003, has been put forward. If this site is allocated it will result in the coalescence of the two settlement areas and an increase of some 25% of the urban area of the village which would be hugely disproportionate to the existing size and character of the village and lead to development far in excess of the requirement identified in the Scoping report.</p>	<p>Pendle Council notes the support for the designation of Roughlee and Crow Trees as a rural village (LP1 Policy SDP2).</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>Pendle Council notes the support for the 3% housing requirement for Roughlee and Crow Trees (LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology, Table 3.10, Page 37).</p> <p>The figures for housing completions in Pendle are updated annually and reported in the Authority's Monitoring Report (AMR). Any new figures for housing completions that are available prior to adoption of LP2 will be taken into account.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>Pendle Council notes the support for the 17 dwelling requirement for Roughlee and Crow Trees over the plan period 2011-2030 (LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology, Table 3.11, Page 41).</p> <p>Housing requirement figures will be updated as necessary as plan preparation progresses, to take account of new monitoring data.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>The site appraisal process will help to determine the most sustainable sites for future housing development in and around Roughlee and Crow Trees. This will then be formalised following discussions with the Parish council and other interested parties, subject to the requirements of national and local planning policy.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>5. As noted above Policy SPD 2 refers to “local need” as development appropriate to the Rural Villages. The Parish Council consider that this term should be properly defined in the Local Plan, Part 2.</p>	<p>Local need is a term widely used in planning, but means different things at different times.</p> <p>In the context of the LP2 housing requirement figures it refers to how much housing an individual settlement is considered to need when taking into account the borough’s overall need; the population of the settlement; the number of households in the settlement; past development trends; and the availability of land. This position is summarised in Tables 3.10 and 3.11 of the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology.</p> <p>A report from the Planning, Building Control &amp; Licensing Manager to the May Executive, offers further explanation of the definition of ‘local need’ in this context.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p>
C012SRM	00040	Barrowford Parish Council Mr Iain Lord	<p><b>1. Role of Strategic Housing Site</b></p> <p>In the Pendle Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy a Strategic Housing Site was considered necessary "to increase delivery of housing, reduce the deficit and meet the housing requirements of the Borough in a timely manner".</p> <p>There was no written indication at this stage, or throughout the Core Strategy consultation process, that the location chosen for the Strategic Housing Site would not have the presence of that Site taken into consideration in the allocation of housing identified for that location in the Local Plan Part 2 (from now on in this response: "LP2") housing distribution.</p> <p>Trough Laithe in Barrowford was selected and planning permission for 500 houses has been passed.</p> <p>It is therefore the case that Barrowford has already achieved well in excess of its allocation of 10% of the M65 Corridor requirement.</p> <p>The LP2 Section 3.1 mentions the Strategic Housing site Policy LIV2 but again gives no indication of its effect on the settlement chosen.</p> <p>It is not until Section 3.54 that the previously hidden intention of the creation of the Strategic Housing Site becomes clear, as it is now described as "an</p>	<p>As noted in the representation LP1 Policy LIV2 allocated a strategic housing site at Trough Laithe, a highly accessible location close to Junction 13 on the M65 motorway <i>"to increase delivery of housing, reduce the deficit and meet the housing requirements of the Borough in a timely manner"</i>.</p> <p>As a <u>strategic</u> housing allocation, the question is not about whether the 500 homes should be taken off the allocation for the village of Barrowford in its entirety, but how this figure should be apportioned amongst settlements throughout the borough.</p> <p>LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology considers that as the overwhelming demand for new and affordable housing is within the M65 Corridor that the 500 homes should be ‘top-sliced’ from the requirement for this spatial area alone. The alternative would be to top-slice the 500 homes from the total housing requirement for the borough, which would significantly increase the housing requirement figure for Barrowford.</p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>allocation seeking to contribute towards meeting the housing needs across the whole of this spatial area" and its total number is to be subtracted from the total requirement for the M65 corridor.</p> <p>At a stroke of the pen, taking the 500 houses in Barrowford out of the allocation table 3.11 gives the village a significantly greater allocation, indeed more than any other settlement in the Borough, including the biggest towns of Nelson and Colne.</p> <p>An attempt to justify this decision comes in Section 3.53, which states that Trough Laithe is an "edge of Barrowford" site. This is not factually or materially correct: Trough Laithe encompasses two wards within Barrowford, Carr Hall and Newbridge, and is separated from the edge of Barrowford, Carr Hall Road and Noggarth Top, by some distance.</p> <p><b>Barrowford Parish Council argues that this is a greatly excessive over-allocation of housing for the village, both in terms of simple fairness, and on grounds of infrastructure and planning hierarchy, which will be dealt with below.</b></p> <p><b>2. Addressing Infrastructure Issues:</b> Sustainability factors and current infrastructure provision within the LP2 are centred around table 3.8 page 23. These sustainability factors covering Key Services and Infrastructure are based on a 2008 study updated in 2016 and consist of a list of Key Services with boxes ticked to highlight the presence of specific key services within a given location.</p> <p><b>Barrowford Parish Council feels that this simplistic tick box approach to whether a specific area currently provides specific Key Services is meaningless in regard to the provisions for additional housing. The current capacity and the spare capacity need to be quantified, particularly in education, health and other essential services such as public transport. Using over-simplified data correlation in this manner gives no depth to the data contained in the Key Services section and therefore no tangible basis to ascertain whether any particular service has spare capacity or is oversubscribed. In the case of Barrowford it does not indicate if the additional needs of the Strategic Housing Site for 500 houses have been factored into the current Key Service infrastructure projections.</b></p>	<p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Table 3.2 on page 23 of LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology summarises a lot of evidence that is published elsewhere (see below). It is intended to offer the reader a quick appreciation of the range of facilities available within a particular settlement, and thereby illustrate that it occupies the correct position within the settlement hierarchy. The issue of capacity is addressed in greater detail in the Sustainable Settlements Study (2008), the Infrastructure Strategy (2015) and the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule in LP1 (2015). All these documents contain the findings from extensive discussions and consultation with the key infrastructure providers and represent more than a tick box exercise. Before the site allocations are finalised, further detailed discussions will take place with key infrastructure providers to ensure that LP2 is based on the most up-to-date information available.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of sites on existing infrastructure will be addressed during the site selection process, as</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><b>3. Long Term Key Service Provision;</b></p> <p>The LP2 document feels to have a piecemeal approach to both the provision of Key Services and Infrastructure, with no co-ordinated or coherent plan to address the long term needs of expanding Key Service provision in Pendle during the timescale in which the envisaged 4,808 houses are built.</p> <p>This is particularly relevant in the M65 Corridor, the largest spatial area, which is expected to absorb an additional 3,336 houses. The current method of assessing Key Services requirements at the planning stage looks on each individual application in isolation. What is needed is a measured, integrated approach to providing the increase in Key Services necessary to accommodate the number of houses that the Local Plan is set to deliver over its life.</p> <p>This problem is most acutely shown when the need for additional school places is assessed. Lancashire County Council assess additional need on their own formula, which works on current surplus capacity within a two mile radius for primary and a three mile radius for secondary schools. This approach does not take into account parental choice with many parents buying houses within the catchment area of their preferred school.</p> <p>LCC is currently consulting on their School Place Provision Strategy 2017/18 to 2019/20, looking at past school place trends and with a view to addressing any shortfalls. This strategy pays only scant provision to new housing requirements and concentrates solely on the implementation of Section Agreements for funding if new housing requirements exceed current capacity. The LCC strategy already highlights both Colne, Barrowford &amp; Rural Pendle as hotspots where there is likely to be a significant and sustained shortfall in available primary capacity. (Page 25 LCC Draft School Place Provision Strategy). This raises several questions regarding infrastructure provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Have LCC been consulted on the Local Plan and has there been adequate vectoring in of the housing requirement for Pendle contained in the Local Plan in relation to Schools, Social Services and public transport?</b></li> <li>• <b>Are there similar strategies and data relating to medical provision across</b></li> </ul>	<p>illustrated in Figure 5.1, on page 57 of the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed at this time, but the matters raised will receive careful consideration as part of the site allocations process.</b></p> <p>Early and ongoing consultation has taken place with key service and infrastructure providers throughout the preparation of LP1 and LP2. LP1 includes a detailed Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (Appendix A) highlighting the infrastructure requirements during the plan period. This position is updated annually in the Authority's Monitoring Report (AMR).</p> <p>LCC in their capacity as education and highways authority are contacted directly, as are the utility companies and health providers. We also consult with the police and the fire and rescue services.</p> <p>Full details of who has been consulted and how their comments have changed the plan or evidence base, where appropriate, are set-out in the consultation statement that is published online after each consultation and made available when the next draft of the plan is made available for public comment.</p> <p>At this stage in the plan making process, few infrastructure providers are able to provide detailed feedback to the Council as the final portfolio of site has not been determined. As the preparation of LP2 progresses and preferred site options are identified, the utility companies and other service providers will be asked to provide more detailed responses.</p> <p>It is not appropriate for PBC to comment on the methodologies employed by other organisations outside a formal consultation process.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><b>Pendle and have these been considered?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Have highways and utility providers prepared reports or strategies as to how this additional stress on existing infrastructure will be met?</b></li> </ul> <p><b>4. Barrowford's Role is as a Local Service Centre:</b> Development within the M65 Corridor has already been set in the Core Strategy as 70% of Pendle's total requirement (LP 1). As stated at the outset of this response, the figure highlighted in LP 2 has been netted off to take the Strategic Housing Site into consideration as an M65-Corridor-wide figure, reducing the housing needed in the four constituent parts (Nelson, Colne, Brierfield and Barrowford) along with completed housing and empty property reuse. This reduced figure is then divided between the three Towns and one Village, and on paper reflects their current size and proportion within the M65 Corridor.</p> <p><b>What the Plan does not reflect is the fact that Barrowford is the only Local Service Centre, whilst the other three are Key Service Centres, which are the highest in the local planning hierarchy.</b></p> <p>The decision to site the Strategic Housing Site at Trough Laithe and the manner in which the 500 houses have been 'divvied' pro rata amongst the four parts enables Pendle to significantly reduce the provision needed in three of these areas. The result is to add their reduction to Barrowford total without offsetting this in any way.</p> <p><b>With Barrowford being on the second tier of the planning Hierarchy the proposed additional allocations in LP 2 would seem an abuse of the Parish's lower planning status.</b></p> <p>The proposed further 230 houses, when added to the 500 strategic houses site houses, would make Barrowford the largest contributor of housing in the Borough, exceeding the three Key Service Areas (Nelson by 20, Colne by 217 and Brierfield by 384).</p> <p><b>Such an increase would completely change the ethos and amenity which have preserved the character of the village of Barrowford. The Parish Council calls in the strongest terms for a review of this over-allocation in the next formulation of the Local Plan Part 2.</b></p>	<p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The settlement hierarchy (LP1 Policy SDP1) identifies <u>three service centres</u> in the M65 Corridor – Nelson (including Brierfield) and Colne are designated as Key Service Centres and Barrowford as a lower order Local Service Centre.</p> <p>(i) Trough Laithe is a <u>strategic housing allocation</u>, so subtracting 500 homes from the total housing requirement for Barrowford is <u>NOT</u> a realistic alternative.</p> <p>(ii) The wording of LP1 Policy LIV2 highlights that the strategic housing allocation is required "to increase delivery of housing, reduce the deficit and meet the <u>housing requirements of the borough</u>" (paragraph 10.63). Because the housing markets in the M65 Corridor and West Craven operate independently of each other, in the main, subtracting the 500 homes from the overall housing requirement for the borough was not considered to be appropriate. Under this option the residual housing requirement for Barrowford would have been greater than 230 homes.</p> <p>(iii) The strategic allocation of 500 homes is taken off the total requirement for the M65 Corridor. The residual amount is then apportioned between the <u>four settlements</u> in accordance with the balanced distribution established in Table 3.10 of the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology. This approach ensures that the amount of housing allocated to each <u>settlement</u> is in proportion to its place within the settlement hierarchy. This is the Council's preferred option.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><b>5. House Price Differential: A Further Pressure on Barrowford</b></p> <p>The House Sales/Price charts on pages 26 and 27 of LP2 give a clear indication of what is driving housing policy, as they show that Barrowford property prices have been consistently £65-70,000 higher than Nelson and Brierfield for over a decade. Barrowford Parish Council feel that the proposed approach to housing provision in the M65 Corridor will continue to skew it more towards site viability for developers than to a Local Service Centre's obligation to meet LOCAL needs.</p> <p>Given that proposed brownfield housing sites within the Bradley and Whitefield wards of Nelson are currently unlikely to pass viability tests and would remain undeveloped:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What provision is included in the plan to ensure that these sites are developed, as development is essential to meet the aspirations of the Local Plan to improve the quality and viability of housing stock within Nelson?</b></li> <li>• <b>How can development be guaranteed within the lifetime of the plan?</b></li> <li>• <b>Would failure of the regeneration strategy in Bradley and Whitefield lead to further more viable sites within Barrowford and Colne having to be found?</b></li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 3.44 (page 26) raises serious concerns regarding the intentions and will of Pendle Borough Council and its Planning Department to ensure that the areas of Nelson and Brierfield needing the most regeneration will ever be started in the lifetime of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>This paragraph in reality is a "get out of jail free" card if developers refuse to redevelop Nelson during the lifetime of the plan.</b></p> <p>The unrealistic aspirations contained in the Core Strategy and the creation of housing only areas within Bradley and Whitefield have left large sites such as Riverside Mill and Reedyford Mill derelict for years, with little or no interest being shown in developing them without Council or Central Government intervention through incentives to enhance their viability.</p>	<p>To be considered deliverable sites should be available, suitable and achievable (NPPF, Footnote 11). In the current economic climate most Brownfield sites are not commercially viable.</p> <p>To deliver the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures required to rebalance the housing market and meet population needs, the site allocations in LP2 need to be based on realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and viability of land (NPPF, para 159).</p> <p>In accordance with the NPPF, LP1 Policy SDP2 encourages the use of Brownfield land, provided that it is not of high environmental value. Over the lifetime of the plan economic viability is expected to improve, but in the short-term the Council has created a Brownfield Fund to help bring forward development on previously developed land. To demonstrate the deliverability of the plan and bring forward development early in the plan period it will be necessary to allocate sites in locations where it is currently viable to develop. Failure to do so will mean that it will not be possible to adopt LP2. This would result in developers being able to apply for planning permission on sites of their choosing. This could potentially skew development towards Barrowford rather than viable sites in other settlements.</p> <p>Whilst the key objective of the Local Plan is to help deliver sustainable development (NPPF, paragraph 150), it can only support the delivery of additional housing, it cannot guarantee it.</p> <p>Funding to support the housing market renewal (HMR) initiatives in Whitefield and Bradley was withdrawn by the government in 2010/11. These regeneration schemes focussed on refurbishment and replacement of the existing housing stock, rather than providing large numbers of new homes. Policy 17 of the Replacement Pendle Local Plan</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><b>6. Robustness of Housing Designation Policy:</b></p> <p>Reedyford Mill is a prime example of compromise in housing policy. The site, originally earmarked specifically for 120 plus houses and up for sale for several years, has recently been sold off with the housing number halved and the inclusion of a petrol station/convenience store. The commercial development has been built across the most convenient access to the M65 and the portion for housing relegated to the rear of the site. The initial developer has got his petrol station/convenience store but has put the housing portion back on the open market. This deviation from the original housing designation has resulted in the viability of the remaining housing area being so undermined that now it should perhaps be designated employment land.</p> <p>At the same time a section of land on Carr Road, formerly the stock car stadium, which is ideally situated near to schools, medical facilities, and adjacent to a park, and would be an ideal site for potential starter housing, is likely to be sold by Pendle as employment land.</p> <p>This inability to look at redefining Nelson to meet new ideas of where housing and employment land should be located, restricts the viability of certain sites in the town. Former mill complexes with good access to the M65 have been allocated for housing, whilst existing mill complexes situated in residential areas and edge of town sites away from the M65, blight otherwise potential residential areas, such as Brunswick Street, Southfield Street and Hallam Road.</p> <p><b>The lack of both significant redevelopment and new development in Nelson is of grave concern to Barrowford. There is no clear solution given in LP2 to address the reluctance of developers to develop on sites with smaller gains. Section 3.44 allows Pendle to maintain its house building levels to the required numbers by exceeding the recommended numbers for both Barrowford and Colne.</b></p> <p><b>7. Unravelling Housing Numbers:</b></p> <p>The assumption that the proposed house numbers in Table 3.11 are the final</p>	<p>(2006) identified six sites, which would provide additional land for housing where sufficient replacement dwellings could not be provided within the HMR areas. None of the six sites were within Barrowford.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Reedyford Mill has never been formally allocated for housing, and was occupied until relatively recently. However, a planning application for housing was approved on the site.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.44 recognises that if the Local Plan's aspirations for housing growth are to be considered realistic, in the early stages of the plan period delivery on Brownfield sites will be compromised by viability issues. As a consequence delivery on viable sites, provided that they are sustainable, may need to be prioritised. The examples of Reedyford Mill (now partly developed for commercial uses) and Riverside Mills quoted in the representation offer an example of why this flexible approach is needed.</p> <p>The proactive redefining or zoning of urban and rural areas will be realised through both the site allocations process and the preparation of neighbourhood plans by parish and town councils. Until a strong policy position is established through the adoption of LP2 and any Neighbourhood Plans, the role of planning (but not necessarily the Council) is a largely reactive one – i.e. assessing proposals put forward by landowners and developers against the strategic objectives and policies in LP1 and the Bradley Area Action Plan.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>This is an inevitable consequence of national planning</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>figures is dispelled in section 3.63 which states that the figures should be regarded as a minimum, and strongly indicates that if sufficient developable land is not available in one location then it may be that additional land has to be found in other areas.</p> <p><b>This would seem logical for most areas, but for Barrowford which already contains the additional 500 house strategic site and the expectation (which is strongly questioned) of a further 230 houses, special mitigation should be in place to stop additional overspill from other less viable areas.</b></p> <p><b>8. Land Banking:</b> Barrowford as a lower tiered settlement should be protected from potential predatory actions by developers who use viability tests as a standard practice for improving their bottom line. Some of these predatory developers, once granted permission, land-bank for long periods to maximise their return. This long term land- banking does not benefit the local area but creates years of uncertainty for local residents and necessitates the granting of additional permissions to keep the house build figures within the projections of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Work should be carried out by the Planning Department on assessing whether it is legally permissible for the planning authority to refuse routine renewal of planning permission on sites which have been brought forward by developers and had permission approved, but on which no significant development has been carried out during the lifetime of the permission.</b></p> <p>The revocation of planning approval would not only allow other developers to submit applications on different sites but would serve as a warning to potential land bankers that the added financial premium on the land with planning approval cannot be retained indefinitely.</p>	<p>policy which penalises local planning authorities (LPAs), which cannot demonstrate sufficient delivery of new housing. The NPPF is clear that LPAs should “boost significantly the supply of housing” in their area (para 47).</p> <p>LP1 Policy LIV1 states that the housing requirement of 5,662 dwellings is the minimum figure to be delivered over the plan period (para 10.32). LP2 must facilitate the delivery of that number of new homes.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Pendle Council is required to allocate sufficient housing sites to meet current and future needs. It is also important to remember that to maintain their business housebuilders require a guaranteed supply of land with planning permission. The supply of land needed in a “land bank” reflects the lead-in times required before any construction on site can begin – from applying for planning permission; negotiating with the Local Planning Authority (LPA); finalising negotiations with landowners; discharge of planning conditions; supply chain delays etc.</p> <p>It is inevitable that not all allocated sites will proceed as planned, but there are several reasons why housing sites can stall, which can be misinterpreted by some as land banking by a developer.</p> <p>The Home Builders Federation is adamant that land banking by developers is not an issue, but the Secretary of State acknowledged in a Commons debate that “there is evidence of some firms taking advantage”.</p> <p>Ahead of the release of the Housing White Paper in 2017 it was anticipated that the Government would bring forward radical proposals to tackle the issue – i.e. the introduction of “use it, or lose it” style powers, allowing LPAs to acquire land that they deem developers were holding onto. The actual measures put forward in the Housing White Paper</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><b>9.Trough Laithe Strategic Housing Site and additional Housing Requirements</b></p> <p>Barrowford Parish Council has consistently raised concerns regarding the ability and willingness of the owners of the Trough Laithe Strategic Housing Site to bring forward the development within the required timescale.</p> <p><b>If additional planning permissions are needed elsewhere due to the failure of the Strategic Housing Site to meet the requirements of LP1 in this regard, will any additional sites be treated in the same way as the Strategic Housing Site, with any shortfall being divided pro rata across the whole of the M65 Corridor? Or will it be left solely to Barrowford to provide alternative sites? LP2 gives no clear guidance in this scenario.</b></p>	<p>are far less punitive, recognising that the issue of land banking is not clear cut. The measures proposed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>encourage</u> LPAs to use compulsory purchase powers to <u>support</u> the build-out of stalled sites;</li> <li>• LPAs to consider how realistic it is that a site will be developed when deciding whether to grant planning permission on sites where previous permissions have not been implemented;</li> <li>• LPAs to consider an applicant's track record of delivering housing as a Material Consideration;</li> <li>• LPAs to shorten the timescales for developers to implement a permission from three to two years; and</li> <li>• simplify and speed up the completion notice process.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed at this time, but changes may be required once the Housing Act is brought into effect.</b></p> <p>LP1 Policy LIV2 includes a number of indicators to monitor delivery at Trough Laithe. Should these indicators reveal unsatisfactory progress a number of contingency measures have been identified in the Housing Implementation Strategy (HIA) (Appendix 3). The HIA also acknowledges that the failure to deliver the Strategic Housing Site is a possibility (para B9.2) and identifies a number of contingency measures should this occur (para B9.3), one of which is an early review of the plan.</p> <p>By its very nature a Strategic Housing Site must be easily accessible from throughout the M65 Corridor if it is to serve the housing needs of each settlement.</p> <p>If an alternative Strategic Housing Site can be identified, irrespective of its location, the methodology employed in the calculation of the residual amount of housing to be delivered within each settlement will remain the same (i.e. it will be subtracted from the overall requirement for the</p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><b>10. Affordable Housing:</b>  <b>LP2 highlights that the greatest need for Affordable Housing falls within the M65 Corridor, but does not include Barrowford as requiring any.</b></p> <p>This would seem strange given that the area with the highest property prices within the M65 Corridor falls within Barrowford, along with an additional premium on rented accommodation. The need for affordable/starter homes for young people brought up in the village must be greater than elsewhere in the M65 Corridor, especially when the house price differential shows that house prices elsewhere within M65 Corridor are as low as 50% of similar properties in Barrowford.</p> <p><b>Summary of points</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Barrowford has more than met its M65 corridor requirement through the Trough Laithe site.</li> <li>2. A further allocation of 230 houses, as a result of a decision that the location of the strategic housing site is of no consequence, gives the village a bigger allocation than the towns of Nelson, Colne and Barnoldswick.</li> <li>3. The key service/infrastructure sections take a tick-box approach. Education provision in particular is uncoordinated.</li> <li>4. Barrowford's position as a Local Service Centre is once again being ignored. The character of the village must be preserved.</li> <li>5. LP2 skews housing provision in favour of viability for developers.</li> <li>6. The reluctance of developers to build in Nelson has been aggravated by housing development policy.</li> <li>7. There should be mitigation in place against overspill into Barrowford</li> <li>8. An active policy against land banking should be pursued</li> <li>9 What happens if Trough Laithe is not developed?</li> <li>10. Barrowford is not included for affordable housing.</li> </ol>	<p>M65 Corridor spatial area).</p> <p>If a Strategic Housing Site cannot be identified, and a portfolio of smaller sites is required, the residual housing requirement will be calculated on a settlement-by-settlement basis.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time, but the DM policies in LP2 will seek to address these issues.</b></p> <p>LP1 Policy LIV4: Affordable Housing sets the affordable housing targets for each of the three spatial areas. At the time LP1 was prepared, the Pendle Development Viability Study (DVS) indicated that although some part of the M65 Corridor were more viable than others (e.g. land on the edge of Barrowford and Colne), they were not necessarily viable if a requirement for affordable housing was sought. Although there is a need for affordable housing in the M65 Corridor, general viability does not support the inclusion of a target in the Local Plan. LP1 includes a commitment to review the affordable housing policy whilst preparing LP2. An update of the DVS will provide a more detailed review of viability on different types of site in different areas of the borough. This will allow for a more focussed policy response to the need for affordable housing provision in the borough. It will also take account of any changes brought in by the Government following on from the Housing White Paper.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response																											
C013SRM	00152	Environment Agency Mrs Liz Locke	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above documents, which we received on 24 February 2017. We have reviewed the documents submitted, and would like to make the following comments:</p> <p><b>1. Scoping Report and Site Assessment Methodology</b></p> <p>Comments on Table 2.1: Development Management policies</p> <table><tr><th>Policy</th><th>Title</th><th>Comment</th></tr><tr><td>ENV12</td><td>Natural Environment and Ecological Networks</td><td>This policy should include specific consideration of ecological networks associated with watercourses and wetlands</td></tr><tr><td>ENV13</td><td>Local Green Spaces</td><td>This policy could include reference to the value of green spaces in providing natural surface water management and sustainable drainage.</td></tr><tr><td>ENV15</td><td>Green Infrastructure</td><td>This policy could include reference to the value of green spaces in providing natural surface water management and sustainable drainage.</td></tr><tr><td>ENV21</td><td>Pollution</td><td>This policy should include reference to water pollution, including the release of silt during construction.</td></tr><tr><td>ENV22</td><td>Contaminated and Unstable Land</td><td>We support the inclusion of this policy that sets out details for the remediation of contaminated land</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3"><b>Suggested additional policies</b></td></tr><tr><td>Protecting Water Resources</td><td colspan="2">We would suggest a policy is included that new development considers how it will seek to protect and where possible improve the quality of surface and groundwater; and through the use of water efficiency measures protect water resources.</td></tr><tr><td>Development and Flood Risk</td><td colspan="2">We suggest a policy is included that highlights the requirements of the NPPF (paras 100-104) that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided, and where development is necessary it is safe and doesn't increase flood risk elsewhere.</td></tr></table>	Policy	Title	Comment	ENV12	Natural Environment and Ecological Networks	This policy should include specific consideration of ecological networks associated with watercourses and wetlands	ENV13	Local Green Spaces	This policy could include reference to the value of green spaces in providing natural surface water management and sustainable drainage.	ENV15	Green Infrastructure	This policy could include reference to the value of green spaces in providing natural surface water management and sustainable drainage.	ENV21	Pollution	This policy should include reference to water pollution, including the release of silt during construction.	ENV22	Contaminated and Unstable Land	We support the inclusion of this policy that sets out details for the remediation of contaminated land	<b>Suggested additional policies</b>			Protecting Water Resources	We would suggest a policy is included that new development considers how it will seek to protect and where possible improve the quality of surface and groundwater; and through the use of water efficiency measures protect water resources.		Development and Flood Risk	We suggest a policy is included that highlights the requirements of the NPPF (paras 100-104) that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided, and where development is necessary it is safe and doesn't increase flood risk elsewhere.		<p>Comments on issues to be addressed by the DM Policies are noted.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The additional policy recommendations are noted, but it is considered that LP1 Policy ENV7 already addresses the concerns that are raised.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p>
Policy	Title	Comment																													
ENV12	Natural Environment and Ecological Networks	This policy should include specific consideration of ecological networks associated with watercourses and wetlands																													
ENV13	Local Green Spaces	This policy could include reference to the value of green spaces in providing natural surface water management and sustainable drainage.																													
ENV15	Green Infrastructure	This policy could include reference to the value of green spaces in providing natural surface water management and sustainable drainage.																													
ENV21	Pollution	This policy should include reference to water pollution, including the release of silt during construction.																													
ENV22	Contaminated and Unstable Land	We support the inclusion of this policy that sets out details for the remediation of contaminated land																													
<b>Suggested additional policies</b>																															
Protecting Water Resources	We would suggest a policy is included that new development considers how it will seek to protect and where possible improve the quality of surface and groundwater; and through the use of water efficiency measures protect water resources.																														
Development and Flood Risk	We suggest a policy is included that highlights the requirements of the NPPF (paras 100-104) that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided, and where development is necessary it is safe and doesn't increase flood risk elsewhere.																														

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)		Officer / Council Response
				<p>Specifically: New development proposed within defined areas of flood risk must ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. That the proposed use meets the Sequential and Exception Tests as appropriate, as set out in National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG);</li> <li>II. That a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment is prepared for sites as described in paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework;</li> <li>III. That suitable and appropriate flood prevention and mitigation measures are agreed, implemented and maintained to ensure that development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant;</li> <li>IV. There will be no net increase of flooding to properties within the locality as a result of the development (such as increases in surface water run-off or the reduction in the capacity of flood storage areas) unless suitable and appropriate compensation or mitigation measures exist or can be agreed, implemented and maintained;</li> <li>V. That on-site surface water run-off through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and the use of permeable surfaces are used where appropriate in accordance with Policy DM31 of this document; and</li> <li>VI. There is no adverse impact on, or unacceptable risks to, the quantity or quality of water resources in accordance with Policy DM33 of this document.</li> </ol>	
			Surface water run-off and sustainable drainage	<p>We suggest a policy is included that highlights a requirement for new development to demonstrate how it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• won't cause flooding elsewhere,</li> <li>• will follow the SUDS hierarchy, and</li> <li>• will protect groundwater and surface water quality.</li> </ul> <p>In line with the SuDS hierarchy proposals should</p>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)		Officer / Council Response						
				<p>demonstrate consideration for attenuation measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Store surface water for later use;</li><li>2. Use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas;</li><li>3. Attenuate surface water in ponds or open features for gradual release into the watercourse;</li><li>4. Attenuate surface water via storage in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release into the watercourse.</li></ol>							
			<p>Pg14 Designations to be shown on the policies map – we would support the intention to show flood zones on this map.</p>		<p>Support for inclusion of Flood Zones on the Policies Map is noted.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p>						
			<p>Para 4.21 The SFRA will enable the Sequential Test to be applied, taking climate change into account for the lifetime of any proposed development over the plan period.</p>		<p>Agree with the comments made.</p>						
			<p>Para 5.35 Highlight the application of the Sequential Test at this stage – NPPF para101 &amp; 102 ie. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding.</p>		<p><b>ACTION: Paras 4.21 and 5.35 to be amended to make reference to the SFRA enabling the Sequential Test to be applied in accordance with the NPPF (paras 101 and 102), taking climate change into account for the lifetime of any proposed development over the plan period and reflecting that land should not be allocated or development permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. In instances where this is not possible the Exception Test will be applied.</b></p>						
			<p>Comments on Table 5.1: Criteria for initial site assessment</p>								
			<p>We support the draft Site Assessment Criteria as detailed in Appendix 1. We would wish to add the Environment Agency as an additional External Contact in Table 5.1 as outlined below:</p>		<p>Agree with the comments made.</p>						
			<table><tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Key issues</th><th>External contacts</th></tr><tr><td>Drainage and Flood</td><td>We welcome the inclusion of this</td><td>We welcome inclusion of the Environment Agency</td></tr></table>	Criteria	Key issues	External contacts	Drainage and Flood	We welcome the inclusion of this	We welcome inclusion of the Environment Agency		<p><b>ACTION: Table 5.1 to include additional references to the EA in the sections on Wildlife &amp; Ecology, Open Space &amp; Green Infrastructure and Utilities.</b></p>
Criteria	Key issues	External contacts									
Drainage and Flood	We welcome the inclusion of this	We welcome inclusion of the Environment Agency									

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)			Officer / Council Response
			Wildlife and Ecology	We would like to see the consideration of designated <i>species</i> , as well as sites and habitats.	The Environment Agency can provide data on water-dependent designated species, sites or habitats.	
			Open Space and Green Infrastructure	Watercourses, ponds and wetland features contribute to green infrastructure.	The Environment Agency is a statutory consultee on works affecting main river, and would also wish to be consulted on any works affecting natural or artificial lakes; or works up to 1km upstream of a water-dependent designated site.	
			Utilities	Sewerage infrastructure	The Environment Agency would wish to be consulted on any development where sewerage infrastructure was already considered to be at capacity.	
C014SRM	00356	North Yorkshire County Council Mr Mark Rushworth (Mr Carl Bunnage)	<p>Thank you for consulting North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) on the initial phases of Part 2 of the Pendle Local Plan.</p> <p>The main area of interest for NYCC relates to potential cross boundary/ strategic issues with North Yorkshire. In particular, as an upper tier authority, infrastructure implications.</p> <p>Officers from across our service areas have reviewed the documentation and their technical comments are attached.</p> <p>This response has been endorsed by the Business and Environmental Services Executive portfolio holders.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to continue to liaise with Pendle Borough Council as part of our Duty to Co-operate on the Local Plan as it progresses.</p>			

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><b>Strategic Policy and Economic Growth</b></p> <p>The updated NYCC <a href="#">Council Plan</a> sets an ambition that <i>North Yorkshire is a place with a strong economy and a commitment to sustainable growth that enables our citizens to fulfil their ambitions and aspirations.</i></p> <p>The County Council has developed <a href="#">a plan to deliver economic growth</a>. The vision aspires to North Yorkshire being a modern economy characterised by high quality, efficient transport and communications, higher levels of entrepreneurialism and opportunities for younger people to access good quality employment and affordable housing opportunities. An identified key enabler is:</p> <p><i>Deliver a modern integrated transport network – delivering the Council’s Strategic Transport Prospectus, improving strategic road and rail links between the east and west sides of North Yorkshire to deliver agglomeration benefits within the County by connecting North Yorkshire to the Northern Powerhouse and the rest of the UK.</i></p> <p>The <a href="#">North Yorkshire Strategic Transport Prospectus 2015</a> sets out how North Yorkshire County Council would like to work with the government, Transport for the North and the Northern City Regions to ensure that improved transport connections allow the county to both contribute to and share in the economic benefits of The Northern Powerhouse. The emerging issues from Transport for the North include possible improved connections across the wider region.</p> <p><b>Heritage</b></p> <p>There do not appear to be any cross boundary issues with regards to archaeology or strategic ecological concerns that we wish to raise that this stage.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <p>Generally the Bowland Fringe and Pendle Hill, the Lancashire Valleys, and the South Pennines National Landscape Character Areas, which provide the broad context, continue seamlessly across the Pendle – NYCC/Craven District administrative boundaries and, due to intervisibility particularly between valleys and hills, changes in one District or character area could affect the character of others.</p> <p>The Forest of Bowland AONB which includes Pendle Hill does not lie close to</p>	<p>LP1 protects the route of the former Colne to Skipton railway line for possible reinstatement and/or road improvements in the A56 Corridor. Clearly transport improvements between Lancashire and Yorkshire are an important cross boundary issue that will be a key point of discussion as the Northern Powerhouse seeks to improve the economic fortunes of the region.</p> <p>The potential impact of new development in Pendle on the highway network and the routes into North Yorkshire (A682, A56 and A6068) will be assessed primarily through the SA process. In addition, LP1 Policy ENV4 requires major applications to be accompanied by a travel assessment or travel plan. Pendle Council will formally approach Lancashire County Council, in their role as the Highways Agency, to seek a technical input into the site allocations process.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>With regard to archaeology and nature it is agreed that cross boundary issues with Craven and North Yorkshire would appear to be restricted to concerns about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The inter-visibility of new development in the wider landscape.</li> <li>2. Possible wildlife corridors along both natural and man-made routes passing between Lancashire and Yorkshire (e.g. rivers, canals, roads and railway lines).</li> </ol> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted and will help to inform later stages in preparation of LP2.</b></p> <p>Potential impacts on landscape character and the wider</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>the NYCC boundary within Pendle District, although elsewhere the effect of any proposals on the setting of the AONB will need to be taken into account. Long distance views to and from the AONB, and in particular from Pendle Hill itself and the north east – south west ridge of which it is part may need consideration. New development should be designed to be as inobtrusive as possible in the wider landscape i.e. using recessive colours and materials, particularly for large commercial building roofs and elevations. Any future development briefs for large sites should include this sort of general guidance, and also landscape character related guidance, if possible.</p> <p>Where the NYCC boundary meets the Pendle boundary, and within the visual envelope, landscape quality is high – in the former Craven Local Plan it all had a local landscape designation. We are unaware of any local landscape designation within Pendle District, but much of the district is valued for its distinctive character and associations. The Lancashire LCA provides more information, as do the North Yorkshire &amp; York and the Craven LCAs, while the Pendle settlements of Barnoldswick (market town and key service centre) and Earby (local service centre) which lie close to the county boundary also have locally distinctive townscapes (as does nearby Thornton-in-Craven on the NYCC side). Any large new housing allocations could have a wider impact perhaps affecting NYCC/Craven District, and siting would need to be given careful consideration.</p> <p><b>Highways &amp; Transportation</b> The following response is from the Local Highway Authority (LHA) as neighbouring authority.</p> <p>The LHA does not wish to raise any concerns but would seek to be involved in Duty to Co-operate discussions over any potential adverse impact from site allocations on North Yorkshire's local highway network. It is the LHA understanding that strategic cross boundary discussions relating to highway matters are ongoing between the authorities and would therefore welcome these to continue as the Pendle Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>Where it is clear that the development will have material impact on the North Yorkshire's local highway network the LHA will want to be included in the agreeing the scoping for the Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP). In other instances it is accepted that it may not become obvious until the volume of traffic heading towards the county boundary is identified through the actual Transport Assessment. In those circumstances it is acknowledged</p>	<p>environment are addressed by a number of site assessment criteria (Appendix 1, Criteria 3.14-3.17 and 3.26-3.28). The environment is a strategic cross boundary issue with all neighbouring authorities and is a standing item on the agendas of Duty to Cooperate meetings. Should any proposed site allocations, however small, be visible from a neighbouring authority or situated close to an administrative boundary, the views of the relevant LPA will be sought.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			that consultations may be delayed. This might relate to development in Colne where traffic might have an impact on the A6068 into North Yorkshire.	
C015SRM	00121	Rollinson Planning Consultancy Mr Andy Rollinson On behalf of: Mr Greg Wilkinson	<p>Having now had the opportunity to review the relevant documentation on behalf of my client, please accept this letter as our comments on this.</p> <p>These comments are deliberately brief as broad support is offered to the general thrust of the document's scope and proposed methodology; for instance, the 'traffic light' approach to the site assessment appears to be rational and is clearly logical moving as it does from broader baseline and ownership issues, through availability and onto more site-specific issues such as proximity to public transport services.</p> <p>The starting point of the Core Strategy's spatial distribution of the overall housing development requirements is acknowledged as is the 61% (of the West Craven Towns requirement) SHLAAA capacity within Earby. Also noted is the fact that the clear majority of the identified affordable housing need is within the M65 corridor, with just 20.8% of the identified need being within the West Craven Towns.</p> <p>Earby's continued identification as a Local Service is welcomed; this status is reflected within table 3.8 Sustainability factors where Earby only scores poorly on its lack of accessibility to the rail network in terms of key services; table 3.10 further notes that Earby has good level of services and facilities relative to the size of the settlement which is a good indicator as to its suitability for planned growth.</p> <p>It is noted from table 3.11 that 287 new homes will be required in Earby, but this figure needs to be considered with some flexibility especially bearing in mind the sound sustainability credentials of the settlement.</p> <p>We have confirmed through a telephone conversation with your office that there is no need to re submit sites which have already been put forward via the latest 'Call for Sites'.</p> <p>The land at Colne Road shown on the attached OS extract has already been out forward and is included within the latest SHLAA; indeed, this is one of the sites which is relied upon the establishment of a five years' supply of new housing sites in line with NPPF requirements.</p>	<p>The general support for the proposed methodology is welcomed.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>The observation that the housing requirement for Earby is not a maximum is correct, as it may be considered appropriate to put some additional housing into sustainable settlements rather than less sustainable locations nearby (e.g. small villages and hamlets with limited facilities).</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p>
C016SRM	01503	Lancashire County Council	In response to the request from the Borough of Pendle Planning Policy Department consultation, Local plan Part 2 Scoping Report and Methodology	The updated strategy for the provision of school places will be taken into account as part of the preparation of LP2.

[illegible]



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>requirement.'</p> <p>The SPT produces an <a href="#">Education Contribution Methodology</a> document which outlines the Lancashire County Council methodology for assessing the likely impact of new housing developments on school places, where necessary mitigating the impact, by securing education contributions from developers. In order to assess the impact of a development the School Planning Team consider demand for places against the capacity of primary schools within 2 miles and secondary schools within 3 miles. These distances are in line with DfE travel to school guidance and Lancashire County Councils Home to School Transport Policy.</p> <p>Planning obligations will be sought for education places where Lancashire primary schools within 2 miles and/or Lancashire secondary schools within 3 miles of the development are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already over-subscribed,</li> <li>• Projected to become over-subscribed within 5 years, or</li> <li>• A development results in demand for a school site to be provided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Response to the consultation</b></p> <p>The Borough of Pendle has previously consulted on the Core Strategy adopted in December 2015 and a response forwarded from Lancashire County Council. The latest consultation provides the updated position within Part 2 Site Allocations &amp; Development Policies (LP2)</p> <p>The updated site and housing allocations does provide a better position of the number of dwellings to be delivered across the district and enables school planning to forecast the impact on primary and secondary schools across the district. Operating a school at its capacity is vital to ensuring the right level of funding is secured to provide the infrastructure and facilities required. Alternatively schools operating below their capacity may develop financial issues and a drop in standards. It is vital that any housing developments either a strategic or a combination of smaller sites are treated the same and new developments contribute to the impact on schools.</p> <p>School Planning divide Pendle District into five key planning areas and use these to assess development against the schools in that area;</p> <p>For primary schools the planning areas are; Barrowford and Rural, Barnoldswick, Brierfield, Colne and Nelson. The entire district is used calculate</p>	<p>reference to the possible need for new developments to provide contributions for school places. In addition proposed Policy SUP5 will provide details of sites to be allocated for new community facilities including schools if a need is identified.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted.</b></p> <p>The Council will seek to comply with LCC's request for developer contributions for schools where appropriate.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted.</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that identifying the location of new housing, through the allocation process, can help to inform the forecasting for new school places. Contributions for the provision of new school places must not unduly threaten the viability of sites and those from smaller sites must be proportionate to the size of the site.</p> <p>Any additional viability evidence that the Council commissions will need to factor in the requirements for new school places.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>secondary schools understanding there is opportunity for students to travel further and greater parental choice.</p> <p>It is noted the number of dwellings to be delivered in the life of the local land has been recalculated to take into account the net reduction of long-term empty homes. The current figure is 4808 indicated in table 3.11 in the consultation document.</p> <p>Based on the new figure the current forecast would indicate the impact of schools in the area.</p> <p><b>Position of education in five years.</b></p> <p>Based on the housing numbers provided from the five year housing land supply and based on the worst case scenario calculating all homes are four bedroom and delivered within the five years would result in a yield of 1827 primary school places and 721 secondary places.</p> <p>Based on these figures and using the five planning areas used by school planning result in the following.</p> <p><b>Primary</b></p> <p>Barnoldswick planning area forecasts there to be surplus up to the five years.</p> <p>Barrowford planning area forecasts there to be surplus up to five years.</p> <p>Brierfield planning area forecasts there to be a shortfall within the five years.</p> <p>Colne planning area forecasts there to be a shortfall at the fourth year of the five year housing land supply.</p> <p>Nelson planning area forecasts there to be a shortfall approximately in two years into the five year housing land supply.</p> <p><b>Secondary</b></p> <p>Secondary schools are assessed on the district as a whole and therefore the impact of housing is an accumulation of the area. Based on the housing land supply and calculated on the worst case scenario would yield 721 secondary places. Using this figure suggest there is a need for an additional secondary</p>	<p>The figure of 4,808 does not include completions or commitments – some of which have already made, or will make, contributions on completion. These should be taken into account in the forecasting for new school places.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>It is clear from the forecasting work carried out that if the level of housing planned goes ahead, additional provision will need to be made for primary school places in the settlements identified. However, as stated in the submission these forecasts represent a worst case scenario. Furthermore it is unclear whether the forecasts have taken into account contributions from completions and existing commitments.</p> <p><b>ACTION: The planning forecasts for school places are noted and will be taken into consideration as part of the site allocations process.</b></p> <p>The Council notes that the current ‘worst case scenario’ forecasts indicate the potential need for a new secondary school in Pendle by the end of the plan period.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>school within the life of the local plan and the need for land and/or contributions to establish a new school. The minimum capacity of a secondary school would be 600.</p> <p>As previously commented, the figures shown are based on the worst case scenario and calculated on all dwellings to be four bedroom. In reality the bedroom mix will change as more detail comes forward at the planning stage and therefore recalculating would potentially reduce the yield.</p> <p>Current permissions recorded are relatively low in numbers and there is still the delivery of the strategic site at Trough Laithe to come forward, this is counted in the housing figure and yield. Forecasting provides as clear a picture as possible and is based on information received from Pendle's housing land supply up to 5 years, above 5 years certain assumptions are made, and assumes that all the housing will be delivered.</p> <p>The phasing of housing in each planning area provides SPT the opportunity to recalculate the impact of new housing and welcome early consultation to in the decision process.</p> <p>As indicated above the need for a new school would be required within the life of the plan however, the strategy of LCC School Planning Team would look to expand existing schools to increase capacity. Expanding existing schools is a preferred option and takes advantage of the infrastructure already in place and safeguards existing schools standards and financial viability.</p> <p>The process does require the statutory consultation process and a defined timescale from consultation, commissioning, to completion and delivery. The phasing of housing coming forward is key to the delivery of an expansion, SPT would request future updates regarding phasing and will provide the most up to date position within a planning area.</p> <p>In terms of the infrastructure project naming, which is in line with CIL Regulations, LCC will always endeavour to name the closest school possible, where is practicable to put the places in.</p>	<p>As these forecasts are subject to change and will impact on the number of school places required, this position will be kept under review.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Should up-to-date forecasts indicate that a new secondary school is required, Pendle Council will work closely with Lancashire County Council to determine how and where additional capacity should be provided. If necessary a site for a new secondary school will be allocated in LP2. If expansion at existing schools is preferred, PBC will work with LCC to consider how and where such expansion should take place.</b></p> <p>Current viability evidence indicates that site viability in Pendle is such that it is not currently feasible to introduce CIL. Should viability improve and CIL become feasible, an infrastructure charging schedule will need to be prepared and adopted.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed at this time. The new Pendle Development Viability Study, to be commissioned in 2017, will indicate if the introduction of CIL is viable..</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>The site at Trough Laithe is a strategic site and subject to master planning, however we advise all planning authorities to treat all developments strategically in their delivery and the overall impact of all developments regardless of size and the impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Table 2.1 indicates the policies to be included in LP2, is noted that education is not included and would request that education is included. It is noted and appreciated that primary and secondary schools are included in the draft Site Assessment Criteria (Appendix 1) any early discussions between SPT and Pendle Planning will help to highlight any areas of concern and provide an updated position.</p> <p>School Planning Team would like to thank Pendle Council planning officers for the opportunity to comment on the latest consultation. As the education provider we appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the vision of the district and would welcome the opportunity to engage in further face to face meetings and provide specific details and data to support the planning process. In the meantime please do not hesitate to contact me with any specific questions with the information provided.</p>	<p>The methodology acknowledges that the cumulative impact of the site allocations needs to be assessed. This will help establish if there are potential infrastructure deficiencies in the Borough.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>LP1 already includes a policy on education and there is no need to replicate this in LP2. Furthermore, proposed Policy SUP5 looks at the provision and allocation of community facilities including the allocation of sites for new schools. This policy could include references to expanding existing schools in order to meet the requirements for school places. Also as previously mentioned Policy SDP8 could include a requirement for contributions to schools.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The Council welcomes the response from LCC's School Planning Team and will continue to actively engage with them as the preparation of the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Comments noted.</b></p>
C017SRM	00807	Mr Raymond Evans	<p>(Please see representation from Lidgett and Beyond comment ID C025SRM and C038GB)</p> <p>I emphatically support the L&amp;B stance and would also like to make some additional comments.</p> <p>1. A key assumption of the proposals is that the population will increase without restriction leading to a requirement for much more housing. The recent Brexit referendum result shows that people in this area do not agree with that finding. The situation following the actual exit from the EU and the strains on the welfare budgets could mean a smaller demand for housing and less support for larger families. Against this background it would not be legitimate to pursue this plan as, clearly, there could be much</p>	<p>It is not yet clear what impact Britain's exit from the EU will have on the population of the borough. However, the Council has a duty to make expedient progress with the preparation of the Local Plan. The Core Strategy sets out the housing requirement based on the government's latest population and household projections, which it is required to use. This approach was found to be sound at</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>rework needed.</p> <p>2. As previously noted in my correspondence relating to the development of “The Rough”, (recently rejected), no account has been taken of the <b>current</b> road problems which need action <b>now</b>. It would be irresponsible to proceed on future plans until progress is assured on this matter which has been apparent for many decades.</p> <p>3. The areas under discussion around Colne are largely unspoilt. If any housing development was to take place it should be confined very small areas and, I suggest, be made attractive to professional workers who are currently under- represented around Colne. However, I would caution against excessive extension of this proposal. One only has to travel to the Ribble</p>	<p>Examination by a government inspector. The government has not issued any guidance relating to the impact of Brexit on the production of Local Plans. The recent Housing White Paper suggests that councils will be required to review their Local Plans every five years. If this requirement is introduced then this would provide an opportunity to reconsider the housing requirement if evidence shows a significant deviation from the existing position. Until further direction is provided from the government the Council must continue to use the available evidence to progress the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Lancashire County Council (LCC) is the highways authority for Pendle. LCC has prepared the East Lancashire Highways and Transport Masterplan which sets out a series of actions to address the traffic issues that are currently prevalent in Colne. However, these initiatives will take some time to come to fruition, with some relying on the provision of government funding. New development will need to adequately address any highways issues likely to be caused by the development. The potential impact of new development on the highways network will be a key consideration in the allocation of sites. LCC as the Local Highways Authority will be actively engaged to ensure that sufficient capacity is available or appropriate mitigations measures can be put in places to allow sites to be allocated and development to go ahead.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed at this time, but the potential impact of sites on both the local and the strategic highway networks will be assessed as part of the site allocations process.</b></p> <p>There is a need for a range of different types of housing throughout Pendle. The density, layout, style and type of housing should reflect and complement existing development taking account of the local characteristics of the area. Proposed Policy ENV17 of the LP2 will establish</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			Valley to see the catastrophic effect around Clitheroe, Whalley, Barrow and Billington of runaway housing development in what was an ideal rural society.	design standards to ensure quality in new development. However, the Council has a duty to ensure that the housing requirement is delivered. A balance will need to be made to ensure that the requirement is met in the most sustainable way. This is likely to mean that a range of different sized housing sites will be allocated in the plan.  <b>ACTION: None proposed.</b>
C018SRM	01087	Mr Phil McGranaghan	(Please see representation from Lidgett and Beyond comment ID C025SRM and C038GB)	Comment noted.  The Local Plan sets out policies to ensure the sustainable development of Pendle, meeting the needs of the borough's population. The plan will be prepared using a robust and up-to-date evidence base and will contain indicators that are monitored on an annual basis. This gives the opportunity for the Council to undertake a review of the plan if necessary. The recent government Housing White Paper indicates that councils will be required to review their plans every five years and this will allow for changes to be made to the housing numbers if required.  <b>ACTION: None proposed.</b>
C019SRM	01207	Dr Terry Richards	Just a general comment. By the time these plans possibly come to fruition counsellors, planners, development speculators will be dead and buried. Do we really wish to set destructive development plans as a legacy for children?	Comment noted.  The Local Plan sets out policies to ensure the sustainable development of Pendle, meeting the needs of the borough's population. The plan will be prepared using a robust and up-to-date evidence base and will contain indicators that are monitored on an annual basis. This gives the opportunity for the Council to undertake a review of the plan if necessary. The recent government Housing White Paper indicates that councils will be required to review their plans every five years and this will allow for changes to be made to the housing numbers if required.  <b>ACTION: None proposed.</b>
C020SRM	00471	Sport England Mr Bob Sharples	Thank you for consulting Sport England on the Pendle Local Plan Part 2: <i>Site Allocations and Development Policies</i> .  I have read through the document and in principle support the main aims and	Support for the document is noted.  <b>ACTION: None required.</b>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>objectives.</p> <p>It is vital to ensure there is suitable infrastructure for both the existing community and the new residents in Pendle. I believe that Pendle does not yet have an up to date robust playing pitch strategy. Therefore Sport England could not support the loss of any active playing pitch sites or lapsed site until the PPS was adopted. And therefore could not support any site allocations for alternative uses for these sites, including lapsed sites, unless there are to be replaced as per the NPPF paragraph 74.</p> <p>I would also like to draw your attention to the economic benefits of sport: in 2010, sport and sport-related activity contributed £20.3 billion to the English economy – 1.9% of the England total. The contribution to employment is even greater – sport and sport-related activity is estimated to support over 400,000 full-time equivalent jobs, 2.3% of all jobs in England.</p> <p>All local authorities in England can demonstrate how sport benefits their economy using our new Economic Value of Sport – Local Model.</p> <p>The model produces area based (local authority, county sport partnership and local enterprise partnership) estimates on sports' contribution to the local economy in the form of business output (GVA) and jobs plus wider benefits like health.</p> <p>The model also allows you to refine some of the results by using local information you may have available. In addition you can begin to assess the impact of sport investments too – for example, what additional economic value is created as a result of an increase in participation in Pendle. This is the web link to find out more: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/research/benefits-of-sport/economic-value-of-sport/">https://www.sportengland.org/research/benefits-of-sport/economic-value-of-sport/</a></p> <p>It is my contention that consideration to the use of employment land for</p>	<p>Sport England should be aware of the joint Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) for Burnley Pendle and Rossendale, which was prepared by Knight, Kavanagh and Page in 2015/16. The PPS was drawn-up with the full support of Sport England and adopted by Pendle Council in August 2016. The Council believes that this provides a robust evidence base which will be used in the preparation of LP2. In addition to this evidence a Review of Indoor Sports Facilities (2017) has been prepared to supplement the findings of the PPS.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required as the requested documentation and evidence is already in place.</b></p> <p>The economic benefits of sport are noted. Pendle is actively supporting the sporting economy, for example the Northlight development at Brierfield includes the new Leisure Box, which will be the new home of Burnley FC in the Community.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The availability of the Economic Value of Sport model is noted and consideration will be given to its use in the preparation of the plan, if necessary.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time, but use of the Economic Value of Sport – Local Model, to inform the preparation of plan policies and potential site allocations will be considered.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>sport, is in fact compatible due to the employment benefits and economic benefits to Pendle. Therefore sport should be considered positively within the Local Plan as an employer.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could please keep me informed for the process of the Local Plan and due consideration to my comments.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to pro-actively engage with Sport England as preparation of the plan progresses.</p> <p><b>Action: None required, Sport England is formally consulted at each stage in the plan making process.</b></p>
C021SRM	00505	The Coal Authority Mr Mark Harrison	<p><b><u>Background on the Coal Authority</u></b></p> <p>The Coal Authority is a Non-Departmental Public Body sponsored by the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). The Coal Authority was established by Parliament in 1994 to: undertake specific statutory responsibilities associated with the licensing of coal mining operations in Britain; handle subsidence claims which are not the responsibility of licensed coalmine operators; deal with property and historic liability issues; and provide information on coal mining.</p> <p>The main areas of planning interest to the Coal Authority in terms of policy making relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the safeguarding of coal in accordance with the advice contained in The National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance;</li> <li>the inclusion of a suitable policy framework for energy minerals including hydrocarbons in accordance with the advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance; and</li> <li>ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduces the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in The National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guide.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Comments on Coal Mining Issues in Pendle Borough</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Surface Coal Resources and Prior Extraction</u></b></p> <p>As you will be aware, the Pendle Borough Council area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. These</p>	<p>The role of the Coal Authority is noted.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>The amount of surface coal resources is noted.</p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>resources cover an area amounting to approximately 22% of the Pendle Borough Council area.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process.</p> <p><u>Coal Mining Legacy</u></p> <p>As you will be aware, the Pendle Borough Council area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities.</p> <p>Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas.</p> <p>The Coal Authority has records of over 171,000 coal mine entries across the coalfields, although there are thought to be many more unrecorded. Shallow coal which is present near the surface can give rise to stability, gas and potential spontaneous combustion problems. Even in areas where coal mining was deep, in some geological conditions cracks or fissures can appear at the surface. It is estimated that as many as 2 million of the 7.7 million properties across the coalfields may lie in areas with the potential to be affected by these problems. In our view, the planning processes in coalfield areas need to take account of coal mining legacy issues.</p> <p>Within the Pendle Borough Council area there are approximately 178 recorded mine entries and around 11 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine</p>	<p>The Scoping Report &amp; Methodology includes a list of proposed policies for the LP2. Proposed Policy ENV22 deals with issues of contamination and unstable land. In line with the NPPF (paragraph 143, bullet point 5), the Coal Authority's request to seek prior-extraction of coal on developments that may otherwise sterilise mineral extraction will be included in this policy.</p> <p>The mining legacy of the area is noted.</p> <p>The potential hazards resulting from past mine workings are noted.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time. The potential sterilisation of coal deposits will be considered as part of the site allocations process. Policy ENV22 will address this matter and the possible need for extraction prior to development. As a statutory consultee Pendle Council will seek the views of the Coal Authority on any proposed site allocations, which should highlight if there are concerns about former mine entries shafts and land stability.</b></p> <p>The site assessment criteria to be employed to appraise all the site nominations includes a criterion relating to the presence of former mine workings (LP2 scoping Report &amp; Methodology, Appendix 1, Criterion3.22). This will help to identify if there are any risks that need to be addressed as part of the allocation process.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards.</p> <p>Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.</p> <p>As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of The Coal Authority may be required.</p> <p><b><u>Specific Comments on the Pendle Local Plan Part 2 – Scoping Report and Methodology and Call for Sites</u></b></p> <p>I have liaised with the Property Section of the Coal Authority and can confirm that we have no sites to put forward in respect of the Call for Sites consultation.</p> <p><b><u>Representation 1</u></b></p> <p><b>Table 2.1: Development Management policies to be included in LP2</b></p> <p><b>Comment</b> - The Coal Authority is pleased to see the proposed inclusion of Policy ENV22 Contaminated and Unstable Land in the Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p><b><u>Representation 2</u></b></p> <p><b>Table 4.1: Local Plan policies influencing site selection</b></p> <p><b>Comment</b> – The Coal Authority is pleased to see that sterilisation of minerals (Policy ENV1) and issues of unstable land (Policy ENV5) are being considered as part of the site selection process. We would also expect the site selection process to include consideration of the most up to date information provided by the Coal Authority in order that the evidence base to the site allocations process is robust.</p> <p><b><u>Conclusion</u></b></p>	<p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology (Table 2.1) indicates that the plan will include a policy on contaminated and unstable land (Policy ENV22) to ensure that new development adequately addresses any potential land stability issues.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>The Council will use the latest information available provided by the Coal Authority in its assessment of sites to ensure the process is based on robust and up-to-date evidence.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			The Coal Authority welcomes the opportunity to make these early comments. The Coal Authority also wishes to continue to be consulted both informally if required and formally on future stages. Thank you for your attention.	The Council will continue to pro-actively engage with the Coal Authority as the preparation of the plan progresses.  <b>Action: None required, as the Coal Authority is a statutory consultee in the plan making process.</b>
C022SRM	01091	Mr Kevin McNulty	(Please see representation from Lidgett and Beyond comment ID C025SRM and C038GB)	See response to comment C025SRM.
C023SRM	00642	Mr Barry Birtwistle	I wish to record my agreement with the response of the Lidgett and Beyond Group.  (Please see representation from Lidgett and Beyond comment ID C025SRM and C038GB)	See response to comment C025SRM.
C024SRM	01523	Mr Andrew Birtwistle	I would like to record my agreement with the response of the Lidgett and Beyond Group.  (Please see representation from Lidgett and Beyond comment ID C025SRM and C038GB)	See response to comment C025SRM.
C025SRM	00294	Lidgett & Beyond Mr David Cockburn-Price	<p>1. This submission is from the Trustees of the Community Charity, Lidgett &amp; Beyond (“L&amp;B”), in response to the Local Plan consultation on Call for Sites, Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Policies - Scoping Report and Methodology, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for Local Plan Part 2, and the Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>2. Members of the Lidgett &amp; Beyond Group aim to preserve the character and wildlife of this what many locals consider to be a special place. Lidgett &amp; Beyond is a Charity and our Charity Number is: 1163523.</p> <p>The Lidgett and Bents area is just outside Eastern Colne. It is a beautiful, largely unspoilt slice of Lancashire’s upland countryside. A large swathe of the area is both Green Belt and a Conservation Area. A magnet to walkers and hikers, it is also dotted with listed buildings dating back to the seventeenth century. Radical changes to planning policy mean that the area is be under threat, depriving Colners and visitors of real countryside right next to the town and replacing it with faceless, depressing suburban sprawl. Lidgett &amp; Beyond is fortunate to have support from local politicians of all parties and is politically independent.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>The description of the Lidgett and Bents area is acknowledged. It should be noted that in the Replacement Pendle Local Plan (2001-2016) a large part of this area was allocated as a Protected Area for potential future development. This allocation was made by a government planning Inspector, following a public inquiry into the plan. The LP2 will need to review the continued allocation of this site given the recent appeal decision at The Rough (Applications: 13/14/0580P and 13/14/0581P) and the need for the Council to allocate sufficient housing sites to</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>3. Pendle is a diverse place, with most of its people living in the four urban settlements of Nelson, Colne and Barnoldswick. However, the majority of the area is rural in character with one-third of the borough of open countryside is protected by international, national or local environmental designations, so at this time of planning flux, Lidgett &amp; Beyond firmly believes that Pendle's Core Strategy should protect and enhance the countryside for the population of Pendle now and in the future.</p> <p>4. In particular, we are against the tacking on of large housing estates on the perimeter of towns. Lidgett &amp; Beyond is acutely aware that all of its area in Eastern Colne's fringes is highly "viable" for building. However, that doesn't mean it should be built on. Profitability for developers is not what best serves communities if they are to thrive. With much of Pendle's urban areas deemed "unviable", most especially its Brownfield land, Lidgett &amp; Beyond understood the rationale when the Community Infrastructure Levy was not applied in Pendle. However, this potentially makes the viable areas extremely tempting to profit chasing firms, as they can now build estates secure in the knowledge that costly community facilities and infrastructure will not be coming off their bottom line. The Pendle Infrastructure Strategy (2014) indicated that Colne, Foulridge and Earby wastewater treatment works were operating at close to capacity. A failure to plan for new development and ensure the timely investment in infrastructure could place pressure on existing treatment facilities resulting in adverse water quality and wider environmental effects. It is important to note that neither developers, nor landowners, will be asked to contribute to an expansion of capacity of the wastewater treatment works as things currently stand.</p> <p>5. In addition, Pendle declared its first Air Quality Management Area on 1st April 2011 due to levels of the pollutant nitrogen dioxide from passing traffic in the Skipton Road/Windsor Street area of Colne exceeding the</p>	<p>meet current and future needs.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>LP1: Core Strategy was adopted in December 2015 and establishes the development needs of the borough. It also includes policies to protect the natural environment, but LP1 Policy SDP2 is clear that some greenfield development will be required in the future to meet these needs. The preparation of the LP2 provides the opportunity to select the most sustainable sites for development.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraph 173) is clear that "plans should be deliverable and therefore, the sites and scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened". The Development Viability Study (DVS) (2014) indicated that the viability of sites in Pendle was such that it would not be feasible to introduce CIL. The DVS will be updated and the position kept under review.</p> <p>LP1 Policy SDP6 requires developers to work with infrastructure providers to ensure that there is adequate capacity is, or can be made available to support the proposed development. Utility providers have an obligation to make sure there is sufficient capacity and therefore must react to the planning process. The preparation of the LP2 provides an opportunity to work with infrastructure providers to plan for the future and ensure that there is sufficient capacity to support the level of development proposed at specific locations.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Tackling air pollution is a serious issue which will need to be addressed by the relevant bodies. LP2 will include a policy on pollution (Policy ENV21) which will provide more</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>levels of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) set down by the government (annual average of 40µg m-3). The vast majority of traffic travelling east from the end of the M65 motorway into North and West Yorkshire passes through the North Valley along the busy A6068. With two lanes merging into one, stationary traffic builds up on this stretch of road. Monitoring data indicates that the average level of NO2 in 2015 (21 ppb) exceeded the threshold average set down by Government (20.92 ppb equivalent to 40µg m-3). With more housing planned for Eastern Colne, this diminution in the air quality is only set to increase. Currently, landowners and developers are asked for paltry contributions to mitigate their contribution to these already worrying air quality readings. Junction Property was asked for just £11,000 with its application for 270 houses on The Rough and just £4,000 for its other concurrent application for 90 houses. It is uncertain how these monies would actually be spent to improve air quality in Colne.</p> <p>6. This freedom from constraint has led to applications of up to 270 houses being received within the Lidgett &amp; Beyond area. Despite claims by the landowner that the development was “marginal” in profitability terms, there is no doubt that this would have been highly profitable for all concerned and yet no new facilities were planned beyond a rather pointless cycle route to Sainsbury’s, which was only included to cynically overcome the accessibility and unsustainability hurdle.</p> <p>7. Pendle Hill, the landscapes afforded by the peaks of Weets and Boulsworth and Pendle’s rolling landscapes with long sightlines, largely unbesmirched by intrusive wind turbines, include some of the most interesting and attractive villages in Lancashire. Together, they form an important part of Lancashire’s history and cultural identity, with folklore surrounding the Pendle witches, the Leeds and Liverpool Canal which provides rich industrial heritage, and literary connections to the Bronte sisters in the isolated hamlet of Wycoller. These heritage assets, including the rural landscapes within which they are located, ought to be safeguarded for continued benefit of residents and the value of the growing tourism sector of the area. Pendle Council aims to grow the</p>	<p>details on the requirements to prevent or limit air pollution. LP1 Policy addresses these issues at strategic level in Policy ENV5.</p> <p><b>ACTION: When allocating new sites for development consideration will need to be given to the potential impact they may have on air quality. Where sites may have an adverse impact, appropriate mitigation measures will need to be provided for development to be considered acceptable.</b></p> <p>The issues raised as part of the planning application at The Rough were considered at the Public Inquiry and will not be repeated here. However, the viability of developments should be carefully assessed to ensure that where feasible relevant contributions are made. As previously stated the level of such burdens should not unduly affect the viability economic of the scheme. An acceptable level of developer profit is usually considered to be around 20% of GDV (Gross Development Value) and this takes into account the risk to the developer.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The landscape, natural and historic environments are key assets of the borough. Proposed Policies ENV9: AONB, ENV11: Landscape, ENV12: Natural Environment and Ecological Networks and ENV18: Historic Environment all aim to provide further support to LP1 Policy ENV1 in protecting and enhancing these assets. However, the plan must also make provision to meet the development requirements of the borough. Where development is proposed on the edges of settlements the plan will need to put checks in place to ensure that they are well designed and sensitive to their location.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>economy of Pendle and it is clear that, by and large, Pendle remains “undiscovered”. For this economic benefit to be successfully exploited, it is imperative that rural development in “viable areas” needs to be exceptionally sensitive, well planned and designed.</p> <p><b>Call for Sites and Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Policies - Scoping Report and Methodology</b></p> <p>8. Lidgett &amp; Beyond broadly approves of Pendle Council’s Sustainability Appraisal laid out in the Local Plan Part 2 consultation document. Naturally, Lidgett &amp; Beyond recommends the Council steers development Brownfield land and proactively uses its Brownfield Regeneration Fund to plug viability gaps. Lidgett &amp; Beyond was disappointed recently to learn that at a time when Pendle Council is struggling to find a five-year housing land supply, it chose to allow commercial sites to use this Fund. The Council should also be working closely with Together Housing, PEARL and the Homes and Communities Agency to prioritise development of land where previously there has been extensive clearances of houses, such as Waterside in Colne. This would be welcomed by the local community. By doing so, this will reinvigorate and regenerate Pendle’s towns. Housing remains astonishingly affordable in Pendle - in 2013, the lower quartile house price to earnings ratio was 3.25 in Pendle compared to 4.95 in Lancashire and 6.45 nationally. In the first five years of the Core Strategy plan period, 23% of gross new housing development (129 dwellings) has been affordable. However, that is just the crude, 80% of market price measure, as used by the Government. There is a sense that the vast majority of existing houses in Pendle are already “affordable”, especially with almost 80% of the population economically active. We fear that over allocation of greenfield sites radically undermines the market for brownfield sites, simultaneously causing ‘needless’ loss of farmland, habitat and our beloved countryside. It also causes underinvestment in towns – the so called “doughnut effect”.</p>	<p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>LP1 Policy SDP2, in line with the NPPF, already encourages the reuse of previously developed land. The site assessment criteria scores Brownfield land highly and where such sites are viable, or can be made viable, in the future, consideration will be given to their allocation. The Brownfield Regeneration Fund is administered separately from planning. It is acknowledged that the fund can be used to help deliver housing on Brownfield sites. In terms of its wider scope, the Council is tasked with bringing Brownfield sites back into use and in some circumstances such sites may be more suitable for industrial development rather than housing.</p> <p>The Council already works closely with PEARL and the HCA to secure funding to deliver housing schemes on Brownfield sites, which commercial developers are unwilling or reluctant to bring forward.</p> <p>With regards to housing affordability, although the prices of some of the existing stock may be low and considered ‘affordable’, the ability of first time buyers to obtain a deposit and secure a mortgage is still limited. This means that there is still a requirement to provide affordable housing in the borough. This is likely to be rented accommodation or a shared equity product.</p> <p>The government has made it clear that local planning authorities must significantly boost the supply of housing. The delivery of new housing is a key national priority. Early delivery of housing in Pendle can only be achieved on viable sites and in some instances this will require development on greenfield land.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>9. Lidgett &amp; Beyond welcomes Pendle Council's use of a Brownfield Register to record 'suitable' sites and the recent National Land Use Database that records 'all sites available'. Lidgett &amp; Beyond would like to see more proactive discussions being had with landowners who have not put their land forward for development, such as in the South Valley, Colne, as well as keeping up discussions with those that have whose land is marginally viable.</p> <p>10. Lidgett &amp; Beyond is one of the stakeholders in Colne's emerging Neighbourhood Plan, alongside the Waterside Neighbourhood Action Group. It shares the Town Council's view that large housing estates are undesirable in Eastern and rural Colne. It is working with the Town Council to provide input into the policies of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Later in the year, Colne Town Council will begin rating potential sites around and in Colne for development using Pendle's own proposed appraisal matrix. Until this exercise is completed then to include potential greenbelt land as "protected for future development" clouds the issue of priority of development and makes it too easy for developers to opt for the easy option of removing forever essential countryside and hinders the more important work of eliminating brownfield sites which are not only eyesores, but have been shown to have negative health effects on the communities forced to live alongside them. Currently, Colne has to find sites for 513 houses. Pendle Council has advised that this equates to roughly 18 hectares of land at standard housing densities. Lidgett &amp; Beyond however, argues for denser housing forms to mirror the urban form of historic Colne and reduce the effects of suburban sprawl, which would not only be inappropriate, but also unsustainable.</p> <p>(See comment C038GB for representation on the Green Belt Assessment)</p>	<p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The new Brownfield Register provides an opportunity to identify previously developed land as being suitable for development. The register provides developers with a portfolio of sites that could be developed for housing. Discussions will take place with landowners during the preparation of LP2 as part of the allocation process.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>It will be important for Colne Town Council and Pendle Borough Council to work closely together when preparing their respective plans to ensure that adequate provision is made for housing in the plan period and beyond. The Local Plan has to look to the future and carefully consider all site options. This includes looking to allocate sites for longer term development needs (safeguarded sites).</p> <p>The Council has used an average density to help give some indication of the amount of land which may be needed over the plan period. However, each development site will have its own set of circumstances and should be developed at a density most appropriate to its location. This may mean that a lesser amount of land is required but it could also mean that more land is required. It is important to note that the provision of new housing is to meet the needs of the population and help to diversify the local housing market, which in some areas will mean the provision of lower density housing.</p> <p><b>ACTION: The policy associated with the allocation of safeguarded sites should make clear that they are allocated for future development should a need arise and only be brought forward following a review of the Local Plan (i.e. not before the end of the plan period).</b></p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><b>Housing White Paper and the Scale of Development Identified</b></p> <p>15. Lidgett &amp; Beyond, along with many local councillors, thinks that the target of 298 new dwellings per year is too high, so we welcome the standardisation that appears to be being brought in by the Housing White Paper to assess the housing numbers an area needs. There is no doubt that the growth in this area is extremely low, so even with economic optimism and diminishing numbers of people per household, there seems to be no need to foist over 5,600 new houses on largely rural Pendle during the life of the Local Plan. Given that large numbers of rental property in Pendle are currently occupied by European migrant workers, some of whom my return after Brexit, we feel the population in Pendle might, once again, continue to fall. Certainly, the current housing market is far from buoyant and the release of large numbers of new homes will cause further stagnation. Nor is Pendle property “unaffordable”. In fact, aside from Burnley, Pendle is the cheapest place in England to buy a house. It would be reasonable to opine locally, “Housing Crisis, what Housing Crisis?”! Lidgett &amp; Beyond therefore urges strongly that Pendle Council should have its Housing Target reassessed as soon as possible, which we believe to be in just over a year’s time.</p> <p>16. We do welcome some of the measures announced in the Government’s planning policies as set out in the White Paper. However, we deem some of them to be rather more “stick than carrot” in planning and development terms.</p> <p>17. We are worried that it fails to give Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) adequate powers to ensure that developers build out their planning consents within a timescale which allows LPAs to remain compliant with the 5-Year Housing Supply Rule and so avoid the damaging consequences of failing to satisfy the rule. The CPRE has issued a comment to the Housing White Paper are as follows, which could aid the development of local plan policy in Pendle:</p> <p>18. Given that it is the developers who build the houses, not the LPAs, we believe that the planning consent should specify the phasing of the build-out in time intervals appropriate to site circumstances over the entirety of the delivery of the consent. The first phase would have a duration appropriate for the preparation of the site and incorporation of necessary</p>	<p>The Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy was adopted in 2015 and included a housing requirement figure of 5,662 for the 19 year period between 2011 and 2030 – equating to 298 dwellings per annum. This figure was based on the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA,) which followed the approach outlined in the NPPF and NPPG, and used the most up-to-date population and household projections. This approach was found to be sound by a government planning inspector at the Examination in Public.</p> <p>The provisions in the Housing White Paper are not yet policy or law and there are no specific details of how the standardised model for determining the housing requirement will work. Furthermore the population and household projections change year on year and it is not feasible to constantly change the housing requirement figures. Analysis of the different sets of projections since 2003 shows that the current housing requirement sits approximately in the middle of the range of projections. The housing figure is set for the plan period to help provide certainty and a clear and stable position as to the amount of housing to be provided in the borough. It should only be revised if monitoring shows that there is a significant deviation in performance.</p> <p><b>ACTION: The Council will need to react to the provisions in the Housing White Paper once they become policy.</b></p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>infrastructure (roads, utilities, etc); for a very large site or a highly contaminated brownfield site, this might be as long as 3 years, but one or two years would be more usual depending on the size of the site. Subsequent phases would have durations appropriate to the number of units to be completed, typically three years, until the consent is fully delivered.”</p> <p>We were disappointed to note the liberal use of the Developers’ Get Out Clause of: “unless viability would be affected”, particularly with reference to beginning work on site within two years of planning permission being granted. This Get Out Clause would always be invoked in Pendle. Currently, Pendle has granted planning permission for approximately 1,000 dwellings where the build has not begun. This, although it may be in accordance with current methods of calculation, is clearly not indeed a practical method of working and probably works to the contrary by encouraging land banking.</p> <p>19. Throughout the entire duration of the build-out, the land associated with the development would remain in the estimate of the housing land supply. At present, if the consent refers to a large number of units, after five years the land associated with the unbuilt units is excluded from the estimate of the housing land supply. Thus, in order to remain compliant with the 5YHLS rule, the LPA must allocate the equivalent amount of land, often putting at risk the unnecessary development of further greenfield or Green Belt land. Lidgett &amp; Beyond agrees with the CPRE that LPAs should be empowered to stop what is clearly an irrational process.</p> <p>20. Our area of Pendle contains many absentee and speculative landlords, such as Junction Property, The Emmott Estate and The Butler Estate. Ostensibly, they own land used for agricultural purposes that typically contains options for development. They in turn are hoping to make large profits on poor grazing land by selling to developers, who in turn, play the system to their advantage: land banking, reapplying to have planning conditions removed and controlling development rates to maintain house prices while at the same time, the Government has unfairly made LPAs accountable for delivery. Pendle Council only has a small influence over the actual delivery rates. It is the market that decides the housing demand and that, as we know in Pendle, is not great.</p> <p><b>Summary</b></p>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>21. We trust that Pendle Borough Council, in so far as the National Planning Policy Framework allows, will adopt a Core Strategy and Site Allocations and Development Policies that enables urban locations to be revitalised and the rural places to be protected for the benefit of people today and in the future, the “golden thread of sustainable development” in the medium- to long-term. We especially draw your attention to para 13, which highlights areas of disagreement (as well as some agreement) with the Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>22. Our members expect that their views will be listened to by Pendle Borough Council following this public consultation and that, when the land allocation phase is completed, none of the sensitive land parcels valued by them are designated as Protected Areas (for development) and, indeed, that they are afforded the full and proper Green Belt protection they deserve.</p>	<p>LP1: Core Strategy was adopted in December 2015 after being found sound at examination by a government planning inspector. The LP2 is currently under preparation. Further public consultation will be carried out which will provide an opportunity to comment on the next iteration of the plan.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>All representations submitted to the consultation will be carefully considered and responded to. The site assessment process is designed to identify and help select the most suitable sites for allocation and to identify reserved sites for future development. Removing or adding parcels of land to the Green Belt can only be done where there are exceptional circumstances to warrant such a change to the Green Belt (NPPF paragraph 83).</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p>
C026SRM	01524	Rural Solutions Mr Mike Powell on behalf of: Ribble Estates Mr Tim Webber	<p>Along with the Site Allocations document, the Scoping Report and Methodology is also subject to consultation. The document acknowledges that Laneshawbridge is one of the borough's larger rural villages and that it has proximity and good access to the Key Service Centre of Colne, just a mile or so to the west. We note that the amount of housing proposed to distribute to Laneshawbridge is 8% of the total requirement for Rural Pendle, but, given the suitability of the settlement to accommodate further sustainable housing growth, we consider that this figure should be increased to reflect this.</p> <p>In terms of the methodology, we agree that new development sites should be assessed against economic, social and environmental considerations, in line with the NPPF, and to identify a range of sites that will make a positive contribution to sustainable development in the borough.</p> <p>Recommended changes: We consider that the amount of housing to distribute to Laneshawbridge is increased from 8% of the total requirement for Rural Pendle to reflect the suitability of the settlement.</p> <p>(N.B. Representation submitted twice as part of two site nomination</p>	<p>The LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology sets out the evidence used to support the chosen distribution of housing to each settlement in Pendle (Tables 3.10 and 3.11). The amount of housing distributed to Laneshaw Bridge is appropriate given its status as a Rural Village. The representor has not provided any evidence to justify an alternative figure for Laneshaw Bridge.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Support for the Methodology is noted.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>The Council cannot change the proposed distribution without adequate evidence. As the methodology is considered sound, the Council is not minded to change the proposed distribution figure. LP1 Policy SDP2 sets out the settlement hierarchy and identifies Laneshaw Bridge as a</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			submissions).	<p>Rural Village. The amount of housing distributed to it is appropriate for that type of settlement. The plan is clear that these figures are set as minimums and if it can be demonstrated that there is evidence of further need or demand, or that sustainability issues require it, additional housing can be provided.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p>
C027SRM	00729	Cllr Sarah Cockburn-Price	<p>(Please see representation from Lidgett and Beyond comment ID C025SRM and C038GB)</p> <p>I echo the sentiments of Lidgett and Beyond in response to both the Greenbelt Reassessment and the Local Plan Part II and wholeheartedly agree with them.</p> <p>As a councillor heavily involved in the Local Plan Part II Working Group, I was shocked to see that wholly inappropriate “Protected Land” has been suggested when the councillors’ scoping session for Colne went extremely well and there seemed to be a surfeit of sites to consider in which to site Colne’s allocation of 513 dwellings. I spoke to Cllr Wayne Blackburn and he feels the same. I sincerely hope that the respondents to this consultation are heeded and plots in PA03 and PO38a and PO41 are all firmly classified as Greenbelt in Local Plan Part II.</p> <p>I also think this matter should be brought to Full Council, rather than hidden away at the Exec.</p>	<p>See response to comment C025SRM.</p> <p>To ensure that the plan’s preparation is open and transparent the Council must consider all the sites that have been submitted. These will be carefully assessed against the site assessment criteria.</p> <p>Removing or adding parcels of land to the Green Belt can only be done where there are exceptional circumstances to warrant such a change (NPPF paragraph 83).</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed.</b></p> <p>All proposed policy documents will go to a meeting of the Council’s Executive for consideration and then to a meeting of the Full Council for approval.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p>
C028SRM	00405	Planware Ms Donna Smith	<p><b>Objection to paragraph 9.12 and proposed Policy SUP 6 Supporting Healthy Lifestyles</b></p> <p><b>1. Introduction</b></p> <p>1.1 This response relates to 9.12 and Policy SUP 6 of the above consultation document.</p> <p>1.2 We have considered this policy with regard to the principles set out within the Framework. Local Plans should “plan” positively for</p>	<p>The NPPF does not refer directly to dietary choices, physical health or obesity, but Section 8 requires planning to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities. It emphasises that planning should take account of and support local strategies to improve health (paragraph 69) and ensure the vitality of town centres (paragraph 23).</p> <p>The Health and Wellbeing section in the NPPG supports the NPPF highlighting that LPAs should seek to improve health and wellbeing through the planning system.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>development; be justified; effective; and consistent with the Framework.</p> <p>1.3 We consider that limiting the location and concentration of hot food takeaways would be unsound. By way of overview, the Framework provides no justification at all for using the development control system to seek to influence people's dietary choices.</p> <p><b>2. Such an approach is not positive, justified, effective or consistent with the Framework.</b></p> <p>2.1 Further to paragraph 9.12 of the Scoping Document, restricting the location of Hot Food Takeaway proposals in proximity to establishments frequented by young people is not a positive approach to planning. The Framework "foreword" sustainable development is about positive growth, making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations.</p> <p>2.2 The proposed restriction, takes an ambiguous view of Hot Food Takeaway uses in proximity to establishments frequented by young people (e.g. schools, colleges, youth clubs etc). This is contrary to Para 14 of the Framework which advises authorities to positively seek opportunities to meet development needs of their area.</p> <p>2.3 Thus is inconsistent with Para 19 and 21 of the Framework. Para 19 states:</p> <p><i>Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.</i></p> <p>2.4 Para 21 states:</p> <p><i>Investment in business should not be over-burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations.</i></p> <p>2.5 There is a lack of evidence to demonstrate the link between fast food, schools, colleges and youth clubs. We confirm this at <b>Appendix A.</b></p> <p>2.6 A systematic review of the existing evidence base by Oxford University</p>	<p>The LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology (paragraph 9.12) acknowledges if the planning system is to be used to control hot food takeaways then it must be properly evidenced.</p> <p>In England, 24.8% of adults are classified as obese and 61.7% are either overweight or obese, according to the Health and Social Care Information Centre. This is more than three times what they were in 1980, when only 6% of men and 8% of women were obese. In Pendle overweight and obesity levels are higher than the England average for both children and adults.</p> <p>The cause of the rapid rise in obesity has been blamed on modern lifestyles, desk-bound working and the consumption of high-calorie food. The consequences of obesity on our health include diabetes, heart disease and cancer, and people dying needlessly from avoidable diseases.</p> <p>Income, social deprivation and ethnicity have an important impact on the likelihood of becoming obese, with women and children in lower socio-economic groups more likely to be obese than those who are wealthier.</p> <p>Studies have shown that the environment has a major influence on the decisions people make about their lifestyle. Known as "obesogenic environments", these are places, often within urban areas, that encourage unhealthy eating and inactivity.</p> <p>Reversing the obesity trend means creating an environment that encourages healthier eating and physical activity.</p> <p>2010 – NICE guidance on the 'Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease' recommended LPAs "to restrict planning permission for takeaways and other food retail outlets in specific areas (for example, within walking distance of</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>(December 2013), funded by the NHS and the British Heart Foundation <i>'did not find strong evidence at this time to justify policies related to regulating the food environments around schools.'</i> It instead highlighted the need to <i>'develop a higher quality evidence base'</i>.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>2.7 This lack of evidence has been confirmed in a number of planning decisions. For example, in South Ribble the Planning Inspectorate raised concerns about a similar 400m school proximity restriction on fast food, stating <i>'the evidence base does not adequately justify the need for such a policy', and due to the lack of information, it is impossible to 'assess their likely impact on the town, district or local centres'</i>.<sup>2</sup></p> <p>2.8 The evidence provided at <b>Appendix B</b> confirms that 70% of purchases by students in the school fringe are purchased in non A5 shops.<sup>3</sup></p> <p>2.9 No consideration has been given to other uses and their contribution or impact on daily diet or wellbeing. The suggest approach is therefore not holistic and will not achieve the principle aim.</p> <p>2.10 There is lack of evidence to demonstrate that purchases in fast food outlets are any more or less healthy than purchases in other A Class premises. Evidence confirming this is set out in <b>Appendix C</b>.</p> <p>2.11 Research by Peter Dolton states that <i>"At least 50% of the days in a year kids don't go to school if we count weekends and holidays and absence. They are only there for 6 hours and all but 1 are lessons. So only around 2-3% of the time can [children] get fast food at school."</i><sup>4</sup> This clarifies that a blanket restriction on opening hours is unjustified.</p> <p>2.12 <i>Similarly, research by Brighton &amp; Hove concluded that 'the greatest influence over whether students choose to access unhealthy food is the policy of the individual schools regarding allowing students to leave school premises during the day'</i>.<sup>5</sup></p> <p>2.13 Only limited purchases of food are made at A5 uses on journeys to and from schools. Further details are set out in <b>Appendix D</b>.</p> <p>2.14 Given the limited access that children have to fast food during the school day, a restriction is disproportionate; is not justified; and would not be effective.</p>	<p>schools)".</p> <p>2011 – the Government set out its vision for how society as a whole can work together to turn the tide on obesity by 2020 in the document 'Healthy Lives, Healthy People: a Call to Action on Obesity in England.'</p> <p>2013 – National Health Service (NHS) published a 'Good Practice Guide', to help LPAs mitigate the health and other impacts of hot food takeaways as part of a coordinated approach to tackle unhealthy diets and obesity.</p> <p>2014 – Public Health England (PHE) published 'Obesity and the environment: regulating the growth of fast food outlets' urging LPAs to use their powers to limit access to hot food takeaways.</p> <p>2014 – the Centre for Diet and Activity Research published a paper "Are takeaways adding pounds?" This concluded that food eaten outside the home was generally less healthy than that prepared at home.</p> <p>2015 – PHE presentation 'Making the case for tackling obesity: why invest?' highlighted that the regulation of hot food takeaways could help to tackle obesity amongst the potential routes to action.</p> <p>All of these studies acknowledge that the causes of obesity are complex, and inevitably extend beyond neighbourhood access to takeaway food. Taking action on hot food takeaways is only part of the solution, as it does not address sweets and other high-calorie food that children can buy in shops near schools. Nevertheless, limiting the number of takeaway food outlets encountered on a daily basis may be one way of positively influencing diets and body weight.</p> <p>A policy looking to restrict A5 uses, without any further justification, would be unsound against the NPPF.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>2.15 Such an approach would have a disproportionate effect on land use planning and the economy when taking into account the limited purchases made by school children who may only have the potential to visit Hot Food Takeaway establishments at the end of the school day, and only during term time.</p> <p>2.16 The Framework cannot be interpreted to provide generic restrictions on a particular use class. Moreover, the evidence does not support such restrictions. The need for evidence is emphasised in para 158 of the Framework which states that each local plan should be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence. Compliance with the soundness test is still required.</p> <p>2.17 The policy or paragraph 9.12 does not accord with the “golden thread” running through the Framework which seeks to build a strong competitive economy. Such a policy could potentially stifle economic development and is not consistent with the Framework.</p> <p><b>3. Soundness - summary</b></p> <p>3.1 We consider that restricting the location, concentration and distribution of hot food takeaways in proximity to sensitive uses would be unsound and fails to meet the four tests of the Framework. It is not a positive approach to planning; justified; effective; or consistent with national planning policy. Such a policy should therefore not be taken forward to the next stage of the plan making process.</p> <p>3.2 Many restaurant operators have made major steps to expand the range of healthy options and work with the communities within which they are / will be part of.</p> <p><b>4. McDonald’s has made major steps in recent years to expand the range of healthy offerings</b></p> <p>4.1 As a responsible business, McDonald’s recognises it has a role to play to support its staff, customers, and the communities in which it operates to live healthier lifestyles. For this reason, McDonald’s has invested significantly to evolve its menu over the last 10 years – both to extend the range of choice, and to reformulate our products. For example,</p>	<p>To be sound the Council will need to consider local circumstances to determine if the available evidence is sufficient to support a planning policy addressing A5 uses (hot food takeaways) in order to make a positive contribution towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retail policies, which seek to retain active shopping frontages and maintain amenity and vitality in primary shopping areas, by addressing the adverse cumulative impacts (e.g. noise, odour, litter) arising from concentrations of A5 uses.</li> <li>The wider healthy eating and reducing obesity agendas, by restricting A5 uses in the vicinity of venues frequented by young people</li> </ul> <p>The respondent cites a study from 2013, which states that “there is lack of evidence to demonstrate that purchases in fast food outlets are any more or less healthy than purchases in other A Class premises.”</p> <p>Yet the Government and NHS have both published documents (see above) highlighting the contribution of fast food to poor diets.</p> <p>Whilst the respondent may feel that there is insufficient evidence available, the ‘Takeaways Toolkit’ published by the Mayor of London and the adoption of similar policies by over 20 LPAs in recent years suggests that planning officers and independent planning inspectors believe that there are circumstances in which such a policy stance may be justifiable.</p> <p>There is evidence that there are elevated levels of obesity in communities with high concentrations of fast food outlets (Zenk 2009) and further evidence that such concentrations are highest in areas of greatest deprivation (PHE 2014). There is also evidence that the type of food on sale nearest to schools may influence the diet of schoolchildren. (Engler-Stringer, 2014; Smith, 2013).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that McDonalds restaurants (and their</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>McDonald's has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added porridge, salads, grilled chicken wraps, carrot sticks, fruit bags, orange juice, mineral water, and organic milk to its menu</li> <li>• Completely removed hydrogenated trans-fats from its menu</li> <li>• Reduced salt in our Chicken McNuggets by 36%, and our fries by a quarter since 2003</li> <li>• Reduced fat in its milkshakes by 34% per serving since 2010</li> <li>• Reduced fat in its deli rolls by 42% since 2011</li> </ul> <p>4.2 McDonald's has also led the way displaying nutritional information to help its customers make informed choices. Since 2011, McDonald's has provided calorie information on every one of its 1,200+ menu boards in restaurants across the UK.</p> <p>4.3 This is in addition to the nutritional information that is already available on its website, on its tray liners, on its packaging, and via McDonald's mobile phone app. In 2012 alone, McDonald's received 2.2 million visits to its nutrition web page.</p> <p>4.4 Furthermore, McDonald's is committed to responsible advertising, and advertise to children only food items that are not classified by the Government's nutrient scoring criteria as High in Fat, Salt or Sugar "non-HFSS". All of McDonald's advertising to children features at least one portion of fruit or vegetables, and a no added sugar beverage such as milk.</p> <p>4.5 As a significant customer of British farming, McDonald's buys quality ingredients from 17,500 UK and Irish farmers. It now spends more than £390 million every year on British and Irish produce, compared to £269 million in 2009.</p> <p>4.6 All of McDonald's burgers are made with 100% British and Irish beef. We use whole cuts of forequarter and flank, with nothing added or taken away in the process.</p> <p>4.7 In addition, McDonald's only uses 100% British RSPCA Freedom Food Pork across its entire menu. As a result, all pork suppliers are required to meet strict animal welfare standards.</p> <p>4.8 McDonald's was also one of the first retailers to switch to using free</p>	<p>competitors) have done much to improve the nutritional value of their food and that they make a significant contribution to people living healthier lifestyles, as exemplified by their support for grassroots football and other community initiatives. It is also recognised that hot food takeaways contribute to the mix of town centre uses, providing a popular service to local communities, employment and a source of economic development.</p> <p>However, these positive aspects should not deter LPAs from introducing local planning policies to positively manage A5 uses where the evidence suggests that intervention in support of other strategic objectives would be both feasible and justified.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None proposed at this time. The Council will continue to examine whether the evidence available is sufficient to justify the introduction of policies to restrict A5 uses in shopping centres (in order to maintain vitality) and in the vicinity of facilities frequented by young people (in support of the health agenda).</b></p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>range eggs – which it did back in 1998. Free range eggs are now used in its entire menu – including its sauces, muffins and the coating on chicken nuggets. Every year McDonald’s use over 100 million free range eggs, sourced from more than 200 UK producers, and for its work in this area they have been awarded ‘Food Business of the Year’ by the British Free Range Egg Producers Association.</p> <p>4.9 The strength of McDonald’s supply chain – which was clear of any horsemeat – has also been confirmed by Professor Chris Elliott, who said in light of the horsemeat scandal: <i>“McDonald’s invited us to look at farms and abattoirs – it was a very simple supply chain. The other thing I was very impressed about was the length of contract McDonald’s had with its suppliers.”</i><sup>6</sup></p> <p><b>5. McDonald’s also contributes to the community</b></p> <p>5.1 As the Community Partner of the Football Association, McDonald’s has helped to train and recruit more than 25,000 coaches. These coaches in turn have provided more than 2 million hours of free quality coaching, to one million young players.</p> <p>5.2 Over 1,000 McDonald’s restaurants across the UK are ‘twinned’ with a local team to provide free kit, equipment, advice and expertise.</p> <p>5.3 Each of McDonald’s restaurants also conduct a minimum of three litter patrols on a daily basis, and conduct larger Love Where You Live ‘clean up’ events. McDonald’s is also the primary sponsor of the Mayor of London’s Capital Clean Up campaign, to tackle litter across London.</p> <p>5.4 Last year, McDonald’s restaurants in Greater London organised over 50 community clean-up events, with over 1,400 volunteers taking part.</p> <p><b>6. McDonald’s is a major employer of young people</b></p> <p>6.1 McDonald’s is a major employer of young people under the age of 25, and for many it provides a first step on the career ladder. McDonald’s offers all staff the opportunity to gain qualifications which include Adult Certificates in English and Maths, a Level 2 Apprenticeship, and a Foundation Degree in Managing Business Operations.</p>	



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>6.2 McDonald's invest £43 million annually in staff training and development</p> <p><b>7. There is a lack of evidence to demonstrate whether fast food is located by schools, or whether schools are located by town centres</b></p> <p>7.1 When McDonald's looks at the economic viability of a new site, it does not factor in predicted sales from school children or proximity to schools.</p> <p>7.2 Research by Christoph Buck has identified a similar approach with other retailers. His research suggests that <i>'food retailers are mainly located near major roads and in inner cities.'</i><sup>7</sup></p> <p>7.3 Indeed, <i>'food retailers are not clustered around schools for up to 1.5 km'</i><sup>8</sup> Correlations between schools and fast food density are therefore due to the proximity of both to town centres, where there is a broad mix of retail on offer.</p> <p>7.4 With a policy restricting location in place, all A5 development would likely be directed away from major, district and local centres – contrary to the sequential test.</p> <p><b>Appendix A – There is a lack of evidence to demonstrate the link between fast food, school proximity, and obesity.</b></p> <p>1. This has been confirmed by Public Health England and the Local Government Association (November 2013). Their paper, <i>Healthy People, Healthy Places</i> states there is <i>'an unavoidable lack of evidence that can demonstrate a causal link'</i> between fast food, school proximity and obesity.<sup>9</sup></p> <p>2. The same paper states there are only <i>'theoretical arguments for the value of restricting the growth in fast food outlets'</i>.</p> <p>3. Oxford University's Department of Population Health conducted <i>'A systematic review of the influence of the retail food environment around schools on obesity-related outcomes'</i> (December 2013).<sup>10</sup> This was funded by NHS Berkshire and the British Heart Foundation, and is a comprehensive analysis of the existing evidence base.</p>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>4. The research <i>'did not find strong evidence at this time to justify policies related to regulating the food environments around schools'</i>. It instead highlighted the need to develop a <i>'higher quality evidence base'</i> which for instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a consistent way to classify a food outlet, in order to compare results from different studies</li> <li>• Looks at the age range of children, and their interaction with the environment. Age can influence travel time, distance travelled, the availability of pocket change, and other factors</li> <li>• Understands the need to assess a child's mode of travel to and from school in decisions about appropriate buffer distances</li> <li>• Recognises that food environments vary between countries – most associations between food environment and obesity came from North America</li> </ul> <p>5. The review did find some limited evidence for an effect of the school environment on body weight, but it added <i>'these results should be interpreted cautiously'</i>. Of 72 associations, only 19 showed a statistically significant positive relationship between body weight and exposure to food outlets. The review also identified associations with convenience stores as well as fast food outlets.</p> <p>6. A number of studies have reached similar conclusions. These include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Harris – <i>'no correlation between students' being overweight risk and the presence of stores with unhealthy food choices near their schools.'</i><sup>11</sup></li> <li>• Philip Howard – Research <i>'failed to find a consistent association between school overweight rates and nearby fast food restaurants'</i>.<sup>12</sup> If anything, this research found <i>'Convenience stores demonstrated stronger correlations with school overweight rates'</i>.</li> <li>• An and Sturm – <i>'no evidence to support the hypotheses that... less exposure to fast-food restaurants or convenience stores within walking distance improve diet quality or reduce BMI among Californian youth.'</i><sup>13</sup></li> <li>• Fleischhacker – This systematic review of fast food access studies concluded 53% did not find any significant associations between the fast food environment and obesity. <i>'In children, only one of five studies</i></li> </ul>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><i>found an association between BMI and the fast food environment.</i><sup>14</sup></p> <p>7. This lack of evidence has also been confirmed in a number of planning decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For example, in South Ribble the Planning Inspectorate raised concerns about a similar 400m school proximity restriction on fast food, stating <i>‘the evidence base does not adequately justify the need for such a policy’, and due to the lack of information, it is impossible to ‘assess their likely impact on the town, district or local centres’.</i><sup>15</sup></li> <li>Further, in Newham the Planning Inspectorate called for <i>‘deletion of an exclusion zone for A5 use class within 400m of secondary schools’</i> as <i>‘the policy is not supported by the evidence at present’.</i><sup>16</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>Appendix B – Food in the school fringe tends to be purchased in non-A5 properties.</b></p> <p>1. Research by Professor Jack Winkler (London Metropolitan University) into the ‘school fringe’ – found just 3/10 purchases by students in a 400m school fringe were made in A5 properties.<sup>17</sup></p> <p>2. 70% of purchases in the school fringe were made in non-fast food outlets, and the same research concluded <i>‘the most popular shop near Urban was the supermarket, with more visits than all takeaways put together’.</i></p> <p>3. Professor Winkler’s findings are not an isolated case. A report by Public Health England and the LGA states that fast food school proximity restrictions do <i>‘not address sweets and other high-calorie food that children can buy in shops near schools.’</i><sup>18</sup></p> <p>4. Research by Brighton and Hove found that <i>‘Newsagents were the most popular premises [in the school fringe], with more pupils visiting newsagents than any A5 premises’.</i><sup>19</sup></p> <p>5. Likewise, research for the Food Standards Agency on purchasing habits in Scotland found that <i>‘Supermarkets were the place that children reported they most frequently bought food or drinks from at lunchtime’.</i><sup>20</sup></p> <p>6. Indeed, there are several more researchers who have found no evidence to support the hypothesis that less exposure to fast food, or better access to</p>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>supermarkets are related to higher diet quality or lower BMI in children.<sup>21 22 23</sup></p> <p><b>Appendix C – There is a lack of evidence to demonstrate that purchases in fast food outlets are any more or less healthy than purchases in other A class premises.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A key finding of Brighton &amp; Hove’s research was that <i>‘newsagents and supermarkets [are] equally as influential on the unhealthy choices of pupils.’</i><sup>24</sup></li> <li>2. Hot food take-aways are identified as a particular concern, but there is a lack of evidence to inform why A5 units have been identified as a concern over other units, namely A1 and A3 units.</li> <li>3. Research by the Children’s Food Trust for instance found that <i>‘Once outside school... students faced an environment designed to encourage less healthy food purchasing, mostly from corner shops and supermarkets near to school, outlets which successfully promoted less healthy foods to this population.’</i><sup>25</sup></li> <li>4. The report added <i>‘this study observed no visits to takeaway outlets’</i> – although it did qualify this saying a <i>‘larger, more representative study’</i> was required to determine whether proposals to restrict A5 outlets are effective in promoting healthier eating habits in teenagers.</li> <li>5. Similarly, research elsewhere found <i>‘traditional fast food outlets offered a greater variety of healthier breakfast entrees, healthier lunch/dinner entrees, and healthier lunch/dinner side dishes’</i> than convenience stores, grocery stores, and supermarkets.<sup>26</sup></li> <li>6. We therefore assert that sole inclusion of A5 premises is irrational, will not be effective, and is therefore not justified.</li> </ol> <p><b>Appendix D – Only a limited number of journeys to and from school involve a purchase at a food outlet.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This has been confirmed in research by the Children’s Food Trust, which found that only 8% of all journeys to and from school included a purchasing visit to a food outlet.<sup>27</sup></li> </ol>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response																		
			<div>Table 3. Total number of journeys including a food outlet visit</div> <table><thead><tr><th></th><th>n</th><th>Number of journeys to school</th><th>Number of journeys from school</th><th>Total number of journeys</th><th>Percentage (%) of all journeys</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Journeys including a visit to a food outlet</td><td></td><td>11</td><td>6</td><td>17</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>Journeys including a purchase from a food outlet</td><td></td><td>8</td><td>6</td><td>14</td><td>8</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>2. Of the food purchases made on school journeys, confectionary was the most popular item sold – which McDonald’s does not offer on its menu.</p> <p>3. Likewise, research by Ashelsha Datar concluded that children ‘<i>may not purchase significant amounts of junk food in school</i>’ – partly due to ‘<i>fewer discretionary resources to purchase them</i>’.<sup>28</sup></p> <p>4. Indeed, even where purchases were made, ‘<i>children may not change their overall consumption of junk food because junk food purchased in school simply substitutes for junk food brought from home.</i>’</p> <p>5. Similarly, research by Fleischhacker highlighted the need for future school-based studies to ‘<i>gather information on whether or not the students attending the studied schools actually eat at the restaurants near their schools.</i>’<sup>29</sup></p> <p>6. This was also highlighted in the systematic review by Oxford University, which states ‘<i>future work should also incorporate a child’s usual mode of travel to and from school into decisions about appropriate buffer distances.</i>’ The review added that age should also be taken into consideration, as this can impact on travel time and the availability of pocket change.<sup>30</sup></p> <p>Footnotes:</p> <p><sup>1</sup> J Williams, P Scarborough, A Matthews, G Cowburn, C Foster, N Roberts and M Rayner, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, page 13, 11th December 2013. <i>A systematic review of the influence of the retail food environment around schools on obesity-related outcomes.</i></p> <p><sup>2</sup> Letter to South Ribble Borough Council, 29th April 2013, from Susan Heywood, Senior Housing &amp; Planning Inspector, The Planning Inspectorate</p> <p><sup>3</sup> The School Fringe: <i>What Pupils Buy and Eat From Shops Surrounding Secondary Schools</i>, July 2008, Sarah Sinclair and Professor J T Winkler, Nutrition Policy Unit of London Metropolitan University</p> <p><sup>4</sup> Peter Dolton, Royal Holloway College, University of London &amp; Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics, <i>Childhood Obesity in the UK: Is Fast Food a Factor?</i> <a href="http://www.made.org.uk/images/uploads/2_Prof_P_Dolton_presentation.ppt">http://www.made.org.uk/images/uploads/2_Prof_P_Dolton_presentation.ppt</a></p> <p><sup>5</sup> Brighton &amp; Hove City Council &amp; NHS Sussex, <i>Hot-food takeaways near schools; An</i></p>		n	Number of journeys to school	Number of journeys from school	Total number of journeys	Percentage (%) of all journeys	Journeys including a visit to a food outlet		11	6	17	10	Journeys including a purchase from a food outlet		8	6	14	8	
	n	Number of journeys to school	Number of journeys from school	Total number of journeys	Percentage (%) of all journeys																	
Journeys including a visit to a food outlet		11	6	17	10																	
Journeys including a purchase from a food outlet		8	6	14	8																	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p><i>impact study on takeaways near secondary schools in Brighton and Hove</i>, page 30, September 2011</p> <p><sup>6</sup> Evidence at Environment, Food &amp; Rural Affairs Select Committee Inquiry, January 2014</p> <p><sup>7</sup> Buck et al. International Journal of Behavioural Nutrition &amp; Physical Activity, Page 7, 2013 -<a href="http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/pdf/1479-5868-10-65.pdf">http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/pdf/1479-5868-10-65.pdf</a></p> <p><sup>8</sup> Christoph Buck et al. Clustering of unhealthy food around German schools and its influence on dietary behaviour in school children: a pilot study, page 6, 2013</p> <p><sup>9</sup> Public Health England &amp; LGA, <i>Healthy people, healthy places briefing: Obesity and the environment: regulating the growth of fast food outlets</i>, page 5, November 2013</p> <p><sup>10</sup> J Williams, P Scarborough, A Matthews, G Cowburn, C Foster, N Roberts and M Rayner, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, page 13, 11th December 2013. <i>A systematic review of the influence of the retail food environment around schools on obesity-related outcomes.</i></p> <p><sup>11</sup> David Harris et al. Location of Food Stores Near Schools Does Not Predict the Weight Status of Maine High School Students, page 276, 2011 - <a href="http://ac.els-cdn.com/S1499404610004574/1-s2.0-S1499404610004574-main.pdf?_tid=720c269e-c3d7-11e3-874e-00000aab0f01&amp;acdnat=1397481765_c271ecb04c8e2d5970dbc420d656f128">http://ac.els-cdn.com/S1499404610004574/1-s2.0-S1499404610004574-main.pdf?_tid=720c269e-c3d7-11e3-874e-00000aab0f01&amp;acdnat=1397481765_c271ecb04c8e2d5970dbc420d656f128</a></p> <p><sup>12</sup> Philip Howard et al. Proximity of food retailers to schools and rates of ninth grade students: an ecological study in California, page 6, 2011</p> <p><sup>13</sup> Ruopeng An, &amp; Roland Sturm, School and Residential Neighborhood Food Environment and Dietary Intake among California Children and Adolescents, page 5, February 2012 - <a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3298889/pdf/nihms358700.pdf">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3298889/pdf/nihms358700.pdf</a></p> <p><sup>14</sup> S Fleischhacker et al. A systematic review of fast food access studies, page 8, 17th December 2009</p> <p><sup>15</sup> Letter to South Ribble Borough Council, 29th April 2013, from Susan Heywood, Senior Housing &amp; Planning Inspector, The Planning Inspectorate</p> <p><sup>16</sup> Report to London Borough of Newham Council, 13th January 2012, Geoff Salter BA MRTPI, The Planning Inspectorate</p> <p><sup>17</sup> The School Fringe: <i>What Pupils Buy and Eat From Shops Surrounding Secondary Schools</i>, July 2008, Sarah Sinclair and Professor J T Winkler, Nutrition Policy Unit of London Metropolitan University</p> <p><sup>18</sup> Public Health England &amp; LGA, <i>Healthy people, healthy places briefing: Obesity and the environment: regulating the growth of fast food outlets</i>, page 5, November 2013</p> <p><sup>19</sup> Brighton &amp; Hove City Council &amp; NHS Sussex, <i>Hot-food takeaways near schools; An impact study on takeaways near secondary schools in Brighton and Hove</i>, page 28, September 2011</p> <p><sup>20</sup> Jennie Macdiarmid et al. Food Standards Agency. Survey of Diet Among Children in Scotland (2010) - <a href="http://www.esds.ac.uk/doc/7200/mrdoc/pdf/7200_final_report_part_2.pdf">http://www.esds.ac.uk/doc/7200/mrdoc/pdf/7200_final_report_part_2.pdf</a></p> <p><sup>21</sup> Forsyth, A., et al., <i>Do adolescents who live or go to school near fast-food restaurants eat more frequently from fast-food restaurants?</i> Health and Place,, 2012. 18(6): p.</p>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>1261-9.</p> <p><sup>22</sup> An, R. and R. Sturm, <i>School and residential neighborhood food environment and diet among California youth</i>. American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 2012. 42(2): p. 129-35.</p> <p><sup>23</sup> Timperio, A.F., et al., <i>Children's takeaway and fast-food intakes: associations with the neighbourhood food environment</i>. Public Health Nutrition,, 2009. 12(10): p. 1960-4.</p> <p><sup>24</sup> Brighton &amp; Hove City Council &amp; NHS Sussex, <i>Hot-food takeaways near schools; An impact study on takeaways near secondary schools in Brighton and Hove</i>, page 28, September 2011</p> <p><sup>25</sup> Children's Food Trust, Page 9, November 2011 - <a href="http://www.childrensfoodtrust.org.uk/assets/research-reports/journey_to_school_final_findings.pdf">http://www.childrensfoodtrust.org.uk/assets/research-reports/journey_to_school_final_findings.pdf</a></p> <p><sup>26</sup> Jennifer S Creel et al. Availability of healthier options in traditional and non-traditional rural fast-food outlets, page 4, 28 November 2008 - <a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2614433/pdf/1471-2458-8-395.pdf">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2614433/pdf/1471-2458-8-395.pdf</a></p> <p><sup>27</sup> Children's Food Trust – November 2011, page 1 <a href="http://www.childrensfoodtrust.org.uk/assets/research-reports/journey_to_school_final_findings.pdf">http://www.childrensfoodtrust.org.uk/assets/research-reports/journey_to_school_final_findings.pdf</a></p> <p><sup>28</sup> Ashelsha Datar &amp; Nancy Nicosia, <i>Junk Food in Schools and Childhood Obesity</i>, page 12, May 2013</p> <p><sup>29</sup> S Fleischhacker et al. A systematic review of fast food access studies, page 9, 17th December 2009</p> <p><sup>30</sup> J Williams, P Scarborough, A Matthews, G Cowburn, C Foster, N Roberts and M Rayner, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, page 13-14, 11th December 2013. <i>A systematic review of the influence of the retail food environment around schools on obesity-related outcomes</i>.</p>	
C029SRM	00336	Natural England Miss Elizabeth Knowles	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 24 February 2017. We have reviewed the documents on the website and offer the following comments on matters which we feel require inclusion in the Local Plan documents.</p> <p><b><u>Scoping Report &amp; Methodology</u></b></p> <p>Natural England considers that there are a number of environmental designations and issues which may affect the size, scale, form and delivery of development sites and should be taken into account.</p> <p><b><u>Designated Sites</u></b></p> <p>At this stage we cannot identify particular sites which may be significantly affected by the Local Plan but suggest that the following designations, amongst others, are taken in to consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);</li> </ul>	<p>As evidenced in the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology, environmental designations are a key consideration when determining which sites are the most suitable to allocate.</p> <p>Appendix 1 lists the Site Assessment Criteria to be used and these include criteria related to the proximity of sites to land designated for its environmental importance, including those listed by Natural England (Criteria 3.7-3.9).</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC);</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA);</li> <li>• Ramsar Site;</li> <li>• National Park;</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and</li> <li>• Site of 20 ha or more of best and most versatile agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>The Local Plan should set criteria based policies to ensure the protection of designated biodiversity and geological sites. Such policies should clearly distinguish between international, national and local sites<sup>1</sup>. Natural England advises that all relevant Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), European sites (Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protect Areas) and Ramsar sites<sup>2</sup> should be included on the proposals map for the area so they can be clearly identified in the context of proposed development allocations and policies for development. Designated sites should be protected and, where possible, enhanced.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be screened under Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) at an early stage so that outcomes of the assessment can inform key decision making on strategic options and development sites. It may be necessary to outline avoidance and/or mitigation measures at the plan level, including a clear direction for project level HRA work to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of internationally designated sites. It may also be necessary for plans to provide policies for strategic or cross boundary approaches, particularly in areas where designated sites cover more than one Local Planning Authority boundary.</p> <p>Further detailed comments on key themes to assist the Local Authority in site selection are provided below. This information may also be of assistance in the development of policies and options to be delivered through the Local Plan:</p> <p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p>The Local Authority should take landscape character into account when allocating sites for development. A landscape character approach should be used to underpin and guide decisions on all development and set out criteria based policies for different landscape character areas in order to maintain and enhance local character and distinctiveness. New development should build-in landscape features and reflect the landscape context of the development.</p>	<p>LP1 Policy ENV1 already identifies and defines criteria to ensure the protection of designated sites for biodiversity and geodiversity. LP2 proposes to include an additional policy (Policy ENV22) which will identify the different nature conservation sites and these will also be defined on the proposals map.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>The plan will be screened against the relevant regulations and an Appropriate Assessment will be carried out if the Habitats Regulations Assessment Scoping Report indicates that it is required.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>Criterion 3.15 requires the principle landscape character type in which the site is located to be identified. Together with Criterion 3.16, this will ensure that the potential impact any proposed development on the site would have on the landscape character will be considered as part of the site allocations process.</p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>Landscape assessments should be undertaken for all proposed site allocations.</p> <p>The plan area includes an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. We advise the LPA to take into account the relevant Management Plan for the area. For Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the LPA should seek the views of the AONB Partnership. Development proposals brought forward through the plan should avoid significant impacts on protected landscapes, including those outside the plan's area and early consideration should be given to the major development tests set out in paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p><b>Tranquillity</b> The Local Plan should identify relevant areas of tranquillity and provide appropriate policy protection to such areas as identified in paragraph 123 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Tranquillity is an important landscape attribute in certain areas e.g. within the AONB, particularly where this is identified as a special quality. The CPRE have mapped areas of tranquillity which are available <a href="#">here</a> and are a helpful source of evidence for the Local Plan and SEA/SA.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity</b> The Local Plan needs to include Biodiversity (perhaps as part of ENV12). Biodiversity is a core component of sustainable development, underpinning economic development, and has an important role to play in developing locally distinctive and sustainable communities.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>Policy ENV1 of the adopted Core Strategy already requires proposals to show how they respond to the particular character type they are located within.</p> <p>The Local Plan Part 2 proposes to include a policy on Landscape (Policy ENV11). This policy will set out the importance of Pendle's landscapes and provide guidance as to how new development should take account of and respond to different landscape characters.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy ENV1 already requires proposals in the AONB to be in line with the AONB management plans. However, the LP2 will include a specific policy on the AONB providing criteria for assessing proposals located in it.</p> <p>The principles set out in these policies will also be used to help allocate suitable sites for development.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>The CPRE's tranquillity map shows where the main areas of tranquillity in Pendle are located – i.e. the AONB and the South Pennine Moors.</p> <p><b>ACTION: LP2 Policy ENV11, which addresses landscape character, to include a reference to areas of tranquillity.</b></p> <p>The strategic policy on biodiversity is addressed in LP1 Policy ENV1. This policy includes details of how biodiversity assets should be protected and enhanced. Policy ENV12 will include further detailed information on matters relating to biodiversity.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>We advise that any development proposals should avoid designated sites, avoid damage to existing biodiversity features, and create opportunities for enhancing biodiversity through the delivery of Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) targets. LBAPs identify the action required at a local level to deliver UK and regional targets for habitats, species, public awareness and involvement. They also identify targets for other habitats and species of importance in the more local context of their geographical area. Further information about Biodiversity in the UK including details relating to UK BAP priority species and habitats is available.</p> <p>Natural England does not hold protected species records and therefore cannot advise as to the likelihood of their presence on allocation sites. Information on non-statutory sites and species records may be obtained from your local Wildlife Trust and/or local Environmental Records Centre and such information should be considered when assessing sites for housing development.</p> <p><b>Priority habitats, ecological networks and priority and/or legally protected species populations</b></p> <p>The Local Plan should be underpinned by up to date environmental evidence, this should include an assessment of existing and potential components of ecological networks working with Local Nature Partnerships, as recommended by paragraph 165 of the NPPF to inform the Sustainability Appraisal, the development constraints of particular sites, to ensure that land of least environment value is chosen for development, and to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is followed.</p> <p>Priority habitats and species are those listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006 and UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). Further information is available here: <a href="#">Habitats and species of principal importance in England</a>. Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) identify the local action needed to deliver UK targets for habitats and species. They also identify targets for other habitats and species of local importance and can provide a useful blueprint for biodiversity enhancement in any particular area.</p> <p>Protected species are those species protected under domestic or European law. Further information can be found here <a href="#">Standing advice for protected species</a>. Sites containing watercourses, old buildings, significant hedgerows and substantial trees are possible habitats for protected species.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>The Council was actively involved in the work that has identified and defined three key ecological networks in the county – two adopted one still in draft. This work was led by the Lancashire Ecological Records Network (LERN) on behalf of Lancashire County Council and the Local Nature Partnership.</p> <p>In combination several site assessment criteria look at the potential for development sites to have an adverse impact on an ecological network (Criteria 3.7-3.10).</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required .</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>Ecological networks are coherent systems of natural habitats organised across whole landscapes so as to maintain ecological functions. A key principle is to maintain connectivity - to enable free movement and dispersal of wildlife e.g. badger routes, river corridors for the migration of fish and staging posts for migratory birds.</p> <p>Where a plan area contains irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland and veteran trees, there should be appropriate policies to ensure their protection. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced <a href="#">standing advice</a> on ancient woodland and veteran trees.</p> <p><b>Geodiversity</b> Planning policies should take a strategic approach to the conservation, enhancement and restoration of geodiversity, and promote opportunities for the incorporation of geodiversity interest as part of development. Local authorities should ensure that appropriate weight is attached to the geodiversity interest of designated sites as well as geodiversity interests within the wider environment, and maximise opportunities to include geodiversity in and around developments as part of the design process. Further information on geodiversity is available at the following website link - <a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/category/30050">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/category/30050</a>.</p> <p><b>Soils</b> The Local Plan should give appropriate weight to the roles performed by the area's soils. These should be valued as a finite multi-functional resource which underpins our wellbeing and prosperity. Decisions about development should take full account of the impact on soils, their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver.</p> <p>The plan should safeguard the long term capability of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification) as a resource for the future in line with National Planning Policy Framework</p>	<p>LERN / LCC have identified three ecological networks across Lancashire. The mapping of these networks will be used to help determine the best sites to allocate for development – ensuring that the networks are maintained and where possible enhanced and that new development does not create barriers to species movement.</p> <p>Proposed Policy ENV12 will supplement LP1 Policy ENV1 to ensure that the strongest protection is afforded to those irreplaceable habitats. Proposed Policy ENV16 will specifically seek to offer protection to trees and hedgerows.</p> <p>The NPPF, paragraph 109 requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing geological conservation interests. LP1 Policy ENV1 already affords protection to those sites designated for their geological / geodiversity importance. Consideration will be given as to whether further policy guidance is required in the LP2.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required.</b></p> <p>The NPPF paragraph 109 requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing soils and preventing new and existing development from contributing to unacceptable levels of soil pollution. LP2 Policy ENV21 will cover issues relating to pollution and will include reference to soil pollution. The importance of soils to the natural environment and their value to society will be referenced in Policy ENV12.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>Pendle has only limited amounts of Grade 3 agricultural land with the majority being of Grades 4 or 5 (poor quality). The site assessment criteria consider the agricultural land classification of each site with those sites of Grade 3</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>paragraph 112 to safeguard 'best and most versatile' agricultural land.</p> <p><b>Air pollution</b> We would expect the plan to address the impacts of air quality on the natural environment. In particular, it should address the traffic impacts associated with new development, particularly where this impacts on European sites and SSSIs. The environmental assessment of the plan (SA and HRA) should also consider any detrimental impacts on the natural environment, and suggest appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures where applicable.</p> <p>Natural England advises that one of the main issues which should be considered in the plan and the SA/HRA are proposals which are likely to generate additional nitrogen emissions as a result of increased traffic generation, which can be damaging to the natural environment.</p> <p>The effects on local roads in the vicinity of any proposed development on nearby designated nature conservation sites (including increased traffic, construction of new roads, and upgrading of existing roads), and the impacts on vulnerable sites from air quality effects on the wider road network in the area (a greater distance away from the development) can be assessed using traffic projections and the 200m distance criterion followed by local Air Quality modelling where required. We consider that the designated sites at risk from <i>local impacts</i> are those <u>within 200m</u> of a road with increased traffic<sup>3</sup>, which feature habitats that are vulnerable to nitrogen deposition/acidification. <a href="#">APIS</a> provides a searchable database and <b>information on pollutants and their impacts on habitats and species.</b></p> <p><b>Water Quality and Resources and Flood Risk Management</b> Natural England expects the Plan (perhaps as part of ENV21) to consider the strategic impacts on water quality and resources as outlined in paragraph 156 of the NPPF. We would also expect the plan to address flood risk management</p>	<p>receiving a low score. This will help to make Grade 3 land less likely to be considered for development. Reference will be made to safeguarding agricultural land in Policy ENV12.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>The site assessment criteria consider the potential impact of new development on the natural environment. Criterion 3.7 considers the proximity of new development to designated nature conservation sites. Those development sites which are likely to adversely affect a nature conservation site receive a low score, or depending on the severity of the anticipated adverse impact will be excluded from the allocation process. Criterion 3.26 looks at potential impact on the wider environment and the mitigation measures that might be required. Criterion 3.27 considers the potential for adjacent land uses to constrain development including the affects from noise and light pollution and traffic generation. One of the scoring elements relates to the presence of AQMAS.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>LP1 Policy ENV7 provides the detailed policy base for dealing with applications relating to flooding and water quality. This policy was prepared in collaboration with the Environment Agency and United Utilities and meets the</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>in line with the paragraphs 100-104 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be based on an up to date evidence base on the water environment and as such the relevant River Basin Management Plans should inform the development proposed in the Local Plan. These Plans (available <a href="#">here</a>) implement the EU Water Framework Directive and outline the main issues for the water environment and the actions needed to tackle them. Local Planning Authorities must in exercising their functions, have regard to these plans.</p> <p>The Local Plan should contain policies which protect habitats from water related impacts and where appropriate seek enhancement. Priority for enhancements should be focussed on N2K sites, SSSIs and local sites which contribute to a wider ecological network.</p> <p>Plans should positively contribute to reducing flood risk by working with natural processes and where possible use Green Infrastructure policies and the provision of SUDs to achieve this.</p> <p><b>Climate change adaptation</b> The Local Plan should consider climate change adaption and recognise the role of the natural environment to deliver measures to reduce the effects of climate change, for example tree planting to moderate heat island effects. In addition factors which may lead to exacerbate climate change (through more greenhouse gases) should be avoided (e.g. pollution, habitat fragmentation, loss of biodiversity) and the natural environment's resilience to change should be protected. Green Infrastructure and resilient ecological networks play an important role in aiding climate change adaptation.</p> <p>Footnotes</p> <p><sup>1</sup> International sites include: Special Protection Areas (SPAs); Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Ramsar sites<sup>1</sup>. National sites include Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and National Nature Reserves (NNRs) Local sites include wildlife Sites or geological sites (a variety of terms are in use for local sites).</p> <p><sup>2</sup> The following wildlife sites should also be given the same protection as European sites: potential SPAs, possible SACs, listed or proposed</p>	<p>relevant paragraphs of the NPPF. It is not proposed to include an additional policy on flood risk or water quality in LP2, although issues regarding water pollution will be dealt with in Policy ENV21.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is being prepared to help provide the evidence needed to make choices regarding which sites to allocate for development – ensuring that flood risk is kept to a minimum. The SFRA will take account of the River Basin Management Plans for the area. The SA also looks at flooding issues and takes account of the EU's Water Framework Directive.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>LP1 Policy ENV7 actively promotes the use of SUDS in new development. A Green Infrastructure Strategy is being prepared to inform the allocation of sites in LP2. Proposed LP2 Policy ENV15 will address issues relating to Green Infrastructure, establishing routes and protecting assets.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>LP2 will look to address issues relating to climate change through a number of policies including: Policy ENV12: Natural Environment and Ecological Networks, Policy ENV15: Green Infrastructure and Policy ENV20: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. These policies will look to provide guidance on climate change adaptation and mitigation measures, emphasising the importance of the natural environment and the opportunities that natural assets can play in terms of climate change resilience.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>Ramsar sites and sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites</p> <p><sup>3</sup> The ecological effects of diffuse air pollution (2004) English Nature Research Report 580 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11, Section 3 Part 1 (2007), Highways Agency</p>	
C030SRM	00540	United Utilities Ms Jenny Hope	<p>Thank you for your consultation seeking the views of United Utilities as part of the Development Plan process.</p> <p>United Utilities wishes to build a strong partnership with all Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to aid sustainable development and growth within its area of operation. We aim to proactively identify future development needs and share our information. This helps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ensure a strong connection between development and infrastructure planning;</li> <li>- deliver sound planning strategies; and</li> <li>- inform our future infrastructure investment submissions for determination by our regulator.</li> </ul> <p>When preparing the Development Plan and future policies, we can most appropriately manage the impact of development on our infrastructure if development is identified in locations where infrastructure is available with existing capacity. It may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with the delivery of infrastructure in some circumstances.</p> <p>Upon adoption, Part 2 of the Local Plan will set out policies to provide additional detail on the adopted Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy. It will also allocate specific development sites to deliver a wide range of uses including housing.</p> <p>United Utilities wishes to submit the following comments to the Council for consideration as part of the current 'Pendle Local Plan Part 2: Scoping Report and Methodology' consultation, in accordance with the consultation deadline of 12 April 2017.</p> <p><b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b></p> <p>United Utilities wishes to highlight that we will work closely with the Council during the Local Plan process to develop a coordinated approach to delivering</p>	<p>The Council will share information with United Utilities on the proposed levels and locations of development to help ensure efficient and effective infrastructure planning can take place.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>The Council will proactively engage with United Utilities to ensure that sufficient infrastructure capacity is available, or can be made available, for the sites to be allocated.</p> <p><b>ACTION: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>The Council welcomes United Utilities commitment to ongoing engagement into the preparation of LP2.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>sustainable growth in sustainable locations which are accessible to local services and infrastructure. United Utilities will continue to work with the Council to identify any infrastructure issues and most appropriately manage the impact of development on our infrastructure during the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Site Allocations</b></p> <p>One of the roles of the Local Plan will be to allocate sites to deliver specific types of development. The Council is aware from past discussions with colleagues that a fuller understanding of the impact on water and wastewater infrastructure can only be achieved once more details are known, such as the timescales for development, the approach to surface water management and the chosen points of connection.</p> <p>Once more information is available with respect to specific development sites, which is often only at planning application stage, we will be able to better understand the potential impacts of development on infrastructure and, as a result, it may be necessary to coordinate the delivery of development with the timing for delivery of infrastructure improvements. We suggest that this should be included as a detailed development management policy and can advise on an appropriate wording.</p> <p>Please note that United Utilities seeks to undertake further discussions with the Council on technical matters relating to site-specific development, such as site drainage and the Surface Water Hierarchy, once the Council identifies its preferred site allocations. In your selection criteria, we would encourage the Council to consider the availability of alternatives to the public sewerage system for surface water discharges. For example, sites with land drains or near to watercourses are a more sustainable alternative to the public sewer.</p> <p>Many of the rural areas of the Borough will be supported by infrastructure which is proportionate to its rural location. Therefore disproportionate growth in any settlement, especially small settlements, has the potential to place a strain on existing water and wastewater infrastructure. We would welcome the opportunity to comment during the Council's assessment of potential site</p>	<p><b>Action: None required, United Utilities is formally consulted at each stage in the plan making process.</b></p> <p>At the allocation stage it is unlikely that there will be sufficient detailed information available relating to a developer's approach to surface water management or potential connection points. This level of information is only provided at the application stage. However, to ensure the sustainable allocation of sites, the Council needs to know whether there is sufficient infrastructure capacity available to accommodate the estimated capacity of the site. The Council will need to work with United Utilities to resolve this issue.</p> <p>LP1 Policy SDP6 already requires developers to confirm with utility providers that sufficient infrastructure capacity is made available to allow their scheme to proceed.</p> <p>LP2 will include a policy on Developer Contributions (Policy SDP8) which could be broadened to incorporate issues relating to infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the offer of further discussions with United Utilities regarding site drainage and the surface water hierarchy. In terms of the site selection criteria the Council will consider including a criterion which identifies potential options for surface water discharge from the site.</p> <p><b>Action: None required at this time.</b></p> <p>The Scoping Report &amp; Methodology already sets out the amount of development proposed in each settlement (Table 3.11). United Utilities will be provided with the opportunity to comment on the proposed site allocations in each settlement to ensure that they are in appropriate</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>allocations, so we can consider at an early stage which locations are most appropriate for accommodating new development and growth.</p> <p><b>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</b></p> <p><b>Infrastructure Provision</b></p> <p>As detailed above, in some instances it may be necessary to coordinate infrastructure improvements with the delivery of development. In accordance with paragraphs 156 and 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), we recommend the following detailed policy is included as part of the emerging Local Plan Part 2 in relation to infrastructure provision:</p> <p><i>“Once more details are known on development sites, for example the approach to surface water management and proposed connection points to the foul sewer network, it may be necessary to coordinate the delivery of development with timing for the delivery of infrastructure improvements.”</i></p> <p>With respect to larger development sites, which can be developed in an uncoordinated and fragmented manner dictated by random land ownership boundaries, we recommend the following:</p> <p><i>“At the larger development sites, it may be necessary to ensure that the delivery of development is guided by strategies for infrastructure which ensure coordination between phases of development over lengthy time periods and by numerous developers.</i></p> <p><i>The Council will support the principle of investment in infrastructure to respond to development and environmental needs. Infrastructure is key to the delivery of sustainable development and economic growth and meeting the development needs of the Borough.”</i></p> <p>With regards to large sites, United Utilities wishes to highlight the challenge that is often presented by fragmented ownership. Whilst masterplans often aspire to secure the delivery of development in a coordinated and holistic manner, this is often a major challenge in practice.</p> <p>We encourage the Council to carefully consider the deliverability issues and practical issues associated with sites in fragmented ownership. On such sites, we would strongly encourage the council to challenge the site promoters to</p>	<p>and sustainable locations.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>The Council agrees that the provision of suitable and appropriate infrastructure is key to the delivery of sustainable development and therefore the plan. In preparing the policies for LP2, the Council will include relevant measures to address co-ordination between the development of the site and the provision of necessary infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>With regards to larger sites in multiple-ownership, the Council will look to require details of phasing, including the provision/upgrade of infrastructure relevant to the site to ensure the smooth delivery of the development.</p> <p><b>Action: None required at this time. For large development sites Pendle Council will seek information on phasing where appropriate to assist key infrastructure providers when planning for future investment and the allocation of capital resources.</b></p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>present a clear site wide infrastructure strategy.</p> <p>On larger sites, it should be clearly demonstrated there is a formal mechanism in place which will ensure the landowners will work together to deliver a coordinated approach to infrastructure over the whole site. This is a key element of delivering sustainable development and is in the best interests of good planning and deliverability.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate the Council has yet to identify any potential development sites as part of the emerging Local Plan Part 2, we strongly recommend this is addressed in advance of allocating specific sites.</p> <p><b>Health and Well-Being</b></p> <p>In respect of health, well-being and maximising the quality of residential amenity, United Utilities wishes to highlight that it is more appropriate to locate sensitive uses (such as residential) away from existing sources of pollution (e.g. noise and odour).</p> <p>In the site selection process, we feel it is important to highlight that new development sites are more appropriately located away from our existing operational infrastructure. This is particularly relevant to our wastewater treatment works which can be a source of noise, odour and attract flies. We will forward you plans of our wastewater treatment works by separate correspondence.</p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>Moving forward, we respectfully request that the Council continues to consult with United Utilities for all future planning documents. We are keen to continue working in partnership with the Council to ensure that all new growth can be delivered sustainably, and with the necessary infrastructure available, in line with the Council's delivery targets.</p>	<p>Site assessment criteria 3.26 and 3.27 specifically consider 'bad neighbour' uses such as wastewater treatment works, and the impact that proposed development could have on adjacent land use, to help ensure that allocated sites are in suitable locations.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>The Council will ensure that it continues to consult United Utilities as the preparation of the plan progresses and is equally keen to work in partnership to ensure the sustainable development of the borough.</p> <p><b>Action: None required, United Utilities is formally consulted at each stage in the plan making process.</b></p>
C031SRM	00238	Barton Wilmore Mr Ian Gilbert on behalf of: Junction Properties	This is an extensive representation, which can be viewed in full online. The following is a summary of the key points raised and these are addressed in the Officer / Council Response:	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
		Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall approach set-out in the scoping report and methodology is supported.</li> <li>• Empty homes are being relied upon as a windfall resource.</li> <li>• Is Pendle Council aware of its current housing provision position in terms of gross and net delivery?</li> <li>• Recognises that there has to be a step-change in delivery, but questions whether sites with planning permission are increasing delivery.</li> <li>• Need to allocate land in excess of the overall housing requirement to provide flexibility, should the supply from planning permissions not come forward, and to help deliver specific types of housing (e.g. affordable units)</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The representation acknowledges that empty homes that are brought back into use can form part of the supply. This is reflected in the Inspector's Report for LP1: Core Strategy (para 67) and in the Housing Implementation Strategy (LP1, Appendix B, para. B7.3). Whilst the reoccupation of empty homes will contribute to future housing provision, they are not being relied upon and no specific allowance is made.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The Authority's Monitoring Report (AMR) in Table HS02a and Appendix K2(ii) clearly sets out the current position in terms of housing provision in the borough. It is clear that the delivery of 364 dwellings is a net figure.</p> <p><b>Action: None required the figures are published annually in the AMR.</b></p> <p>There is agreement that the overall policy position takes a positive stance in seeking to deliver housing, most notably via LP1 Policy LIV 1. This policy has been in place since December 2015 and it will take time to see more housing come forward. The AMR for this year will demonstrate the effect that the Part 1 Plan is having on delivery. However, there is always a delay between the granting of planning permission and delivery of dwellings. Therefore the significant increase in the number of permissions is unlikely to translate into delivery immediately.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>LP1 Policy LIV1 is clear that LP2 will allocate specific sites to meet the remainder of the housing requirement and also allocate potential reserve sites to provide flexibility. These reserve sites will be allocated as a contingency for those circumstances where the allocated sites fail to come forward. This is acknowledged in the Housing</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amount of affordable housing needed is in excess of what can be provided. Where new developments can deliver affordable housing the Local Plan should be flexible enough to accommodate such development.</li> <li>Policy LIV 1 allows for development to come forward on non-allocated sites where it will deliver sustainable development. This is considered a sustainable and positive approach.</li> </ul>	<p>Implementation Strategy (Appendix B, para B9.3).</p> <p>The Examination considered the level of development needed to meet the full objectively assessed need (OAN) for the Borough. Barton Wilmore took part in the Examination and is aware that although there were representations seeking much higher housing numbers, these were not found to be justified. The Inspector's Report (para 59) agreed with the Council that it would be unrealistic to try to deliver other forms of housing by increasing the housing numbers, as the level of development required would be unachievable.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Barton Wilmore participated in the Examination of LP1, where they agreed that affordable housing requirements should be limited due to viability. The need for increased housing numbers to potentially deliver more affordable housing was not accepted as the amount of housing required to deliver our affordable needs would have been excessively high.</p> <p>LP1 Policy LIV4 provides the affordable targets for each spatial area. These were determined based on the findings of the Development Viability Study. The policy is already flexible allowing for a process of negotiation with the applicant to supply affordable housing where a viability assessment can demonstrate that it can be delivered.</p> <p><b>Action: LP1 Policy LIV4 requires Pendle Council "to review the (affordable housing) targets within three years through a partial review of the Plan", and this will be done as part of the preparation of LP2.</b></p> <p>The strategy to allow housing to come forward was agreed in principle as part of the Part 1 Plan. The allocation of sites provides certainty that sustainable housing sites can come forward; ensures that infrastructure can be provided in a co-ordinated way; and that the natural and historic</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If LP2 is to rely on committed and allocated housing sites and include reserved housing sites Pendle Council must understand the rate at which planning permissions lapse and the likelihood of housing allocations coming forward. These are both serious material considerations within the borough which require an evidence based solution; it is completely inadequate to rely on an approach which other Local Plans have applied based on their own evidence.</li> </ul>	<p>environment will be protected from inappropriate development.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>Agree. The amount of land allocated for housing development in LP2 will need to be capable of delivering the OAN, established in LP1 Policy LIV1.</p> <p>Clearly this is linked to the stock of consents that are in place. But, whilst the number of sites with planning permission helps inform delivery, there are other factors that will determine the rate of delivery from sites with planning permission, most notably viability.</p> <p>The representation does not identify a proposed method for calculating the rate at which planning permissions lapse. Predicting the number of planning permissions that will be implemented cannot be done with any certainty, but the application of a 10% discount, an approach widely practised when undertaking calculations of this kind, has been considered to be fair and reasonable in a number of decisions and judgements. Notwithstanding this, the Council will look at past trends in lapse rates over the last 15 years to supplement the evidence base.</p> <p><b>Action: The methodology proposes the inclusion of a 10% flexibility factor (para 3.64). This should be sufficient to allow for the likelihood that not all planning permissions will be implemented or site allocations come forward during the lifetime of the plan. However, available evidence will be used to better inform this position. The site assessment process will seek to ensure that the right sites both with, and without, planning permission come forward to help meet the borough's housing needs. The Council will update the Methodology to include details of how the reserved sites will be identified and distributed.</b></p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If reserved housing sites are to come forward the Plan will need to clarify how they will come forward, particularly as the Plan is one-third of the way</li> </ul>	<p>Agree.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>through its timescale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reserved housing sites should be made available whenever there is a shortfall against the Council's housing trajectory.</li> <li>Aside from a proposed nominal 5-10% increase in the supply of allocated sites (presumably to account for non-implementation of housing allocations) the Council has not made any allowance for any lapse of existing commitments. With the evidence available, it is very difficult to quantify the extent to which a lapse in permissions is likely, however, we consider that some discount should certainly be applied to extant permissions; that discount should be substantial.</li> <li>Table 3.4 vastly overestimates the potential capacity of sites available in the Borough and is incorrect.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action: LP2 Policy LIV7 will set-out the mechanism for the release of reserved housing sites.</b></p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Action: LP2 Policy LIV7 will set-out the mechanism for the release of reserved housing sites.</b></p> <p>LP2 will allocate reserve sites to ensure the delivery of the housing requirement where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Allocated sites fail to come forward;</li> <li>ii) Existing commitments remain unimplemented and lapse.</li> </ul> <p>They will also provide areas of search for longer term future development beyond the plan period.</p> <p>In order to determine the amount of land to be allocated as reserved sites the Council will need to include details in the Methodology of how to identify and distribute such sites.</p> <p><b>Action: LP2 Scoping Report and Methodology will be updated to set-out the mechanism for determining the amount of land to be allocated as reserved sites.</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that there is an error in Table 3.4. The capacity of the SHLAA sites, when expressed as dwellings, should read 5,650 – capacity in the M65 Corridor is 3,861 not 4,561 as shown.</p> <p>The representor is however misinterpreting what the table is intended to show. It does not highlight the sites that are deliverable within the borough, but shows land that has been identified as having the potential for housing to be developed on it. The footnote to the table clearly indicates this and advises that the land is split into three time frames for potential deliverability.</p> <p>The Inspector's Report for LP1 recognises that there is a plentiful supply of brownfield land in Pendle, but caveated</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the timeframe of the Plan has 12 years to run whereas the SHLAA has a time horizon of 15 years. This is indicated to reduce the amount of land available by a further 491 units.</li> <li>Broadly agree with the overall approach to the distribution of housing across the Borough. But, the Plan underestimates the suitability and viability of Colne as a location for new development and fails to recognise its importance in successful delivery of the Plan. Proposed distribution underutilises Colne as a location for new development and suggest that 40% of development is allocated to Colne and 30% to Nelson.</li> </ul>	<p>this by acknowledging that such land had viability issues, which is a significant consideration when allocating land for housing (para 40).</p> <p><b>Action: Table 3.4 will be amended.</b></p> <p>The SHLAA is required to consider a 15 year timeframe, whilst the timeline for the plan is set by LP1, which was adopted in December 2015. There is no scope for change. The SHLAA is just one part of the evidence that will be used to consider the overall supply of housing land. It will be supplemented by other potential housing sites, which will be identified during the preparation of the evidence base for the plan (e.g. the recent “Call for Sites”).</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The overall “Vision” for how the Borough will develop over the plan period is set out in the Spatial Strategy of LP1, and supported by the proposed distribution of development in Policies SDP2 and SDP3.</p> <p>The representation makes reference to altering the spatial distribution agreed in LP1 and expanded upon in Table 3.11 of the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology. But no justification for the proposed change to the distribution has been put forward.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Colne is one of the areas in Pendle that has higher levels of viability. But the distribution of housing is not based on a single factor. A balance must be reached by addressing matters such as local housing need; the availability and deliverability of land; infrastructure constraints and wider environmental considerations as shown in Table 3.10.</p> <p>No details are provided on the nature, location or scale of the infrastructure improvements required; or the level of development needed to unlock the funding necessary to implement such improvements. The comments represent a</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan fails to take into account the ability of further development to help resolve infrastructure deficiencies. Development should be brought forward in areas where there is sufficient viability to bring about the infrastructure improvements needed to facilitate them.</li> <li>The 500 unit strategic site is located in the M65 Corridor, but the number should be deducted from the 'allocation' for Barrowford, which is proposed to accommodate 10% of the Borough's housing requirement. Whilst the site is acknowledged to serve the needs of the Borough this does not detract from the fact that the homes will be built in Barrowford. The housing market and the capacity of services and facilities at Barrowford are no lesser affected by the strategic site than smaller homes built elsewhere. Any oversupply at Barrowford against its 10% allocation should be deducted from the proposed allocations within the spatial area in a manner proportionate to their overall proposed allocation.</li> </ul>	<p>broad generalisation and have no empirical evidence to support them.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Whilst viability is important in ensuring that development will proceed, it needs to be considered alongside the ability of the highways agency and utility companies etc. to fund any infrastructure improvements that may be necessary to unlock development by private developers.</p> <p><b>Action: An update of the Pendle Development Viability Study (2013) is to be commissioned prior to publication of the LP2 Preferred Options report. This will ensure that the evidence used to assess the ability of schemes to contribute towards the provision of any infrastructure that is necessary for development to proceed, is robust and up to date.</b></p> <p>The representation raises two key issues:</p> <p>Firstly the comments somewhat contradict those made earlier in the representation, where it is argued that the distribution of new development should not only be influenced by viability, but also by local infrastructure capacity. The representation also seeks to apply these same criteria to Colne, where their client is promoting a site but does not apply them in equal measure to Barrowford, making for an unbalanced argument.</p> <p>Viability levels are higher in Barrowford than in some other parts of the Borough. It has also recently benefitted from significant investment to increase highway capacity intended to unlock new investment opportunities. Therefore Barrowford could 'in principle' see higher levels of development than those proposed.</p> <p>Secondly the 'allocation' of the strategic housing site was discussed at length during the Examination of LP1. In the Inspector's Report (para 29) he confirms that the strategic</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 3.3 fails to give an accurate picture of how spatial areas are affected by net completions.</li> <li>The housing requirement should not be considered as a ceiling.</li> <li>Broad support for the methodology for assessing boundaries.</li> <li>Land between Castle Road and Skipton Old Road: Sites A and B should be allocated for development, or in the alternative Site B should be allocated as a reserved housing site.</li> </ul>	<p>housing site does not serve Barrowford alone, but provides a site serving more than a local settlement and that (contrary to the views expressed) the site would primarily rely on Nelson for many of its services.</p> <p>Significantly the relationship of the strategic site with Barrowford was not considered sufficient to warrant raising the status of Barrowford in the settlement hierarchy (i.e. from a local to a key service centre). This reinforces the stated objective that the strategic site is intended to serve the housing needs of the M65 Corridor as a whole.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Table 3.3 does not show net completions and is clearly annotated as gross completions. It is there to show the number of newly completed units. The commentary makes clear that demolitions need to be taken into account to reach a net position and this is accurately shown in Table 3.11.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Agree, LP1 Policy LIV1 opens by saying that “over the 19 year period from 2011 to 2030 provision will be made to deliver a minimum of 5,662 (net) dwellings.” The LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology also acknowledges this at para 3.63 stating that “the final housing requirement for each settlement (Table 3.11, Column G) should only be regarded as a minimum.”</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Site A has received planning permission and on that basis is likely to be allocated for housing. Consideration of whether Site B should be identified as a housing allocation or</p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No fundamental objections to the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.</li> <li>• Plan may rely too much on brownfield redevelopment which are susceptible to issues around availability and sustainability. The Plan needs to provide sufficient evidence that those sites will be able to be delivered.</li> <li>• Disagree with 5.10 which indicates that recent trends indicate that small scale developments are less susceptible to market fluctuations.</li> <li>• Consider the long list should include sites under Policy 3A.</li> <li>• Viability and deliverability should form part of the early assessment process.</li> <li>• The Green Belt Assessment ("GBA") should be a different test to the site allocations. Unclear about whether the Council considers there are exceptional circumstances to justify the review of the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<p>safeguarded site will form part of the next stage in preparing LP2.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed, at this time.</b></p> <p>Detailed comments on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report are addressed in the separate schedule prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler (See C007.01SA-C007.03SA inclusive).</p> <p>The Framework and the Part 1 Plan seek to use land efficiently. The use of brownfield land should be considered alongside other land that may be needed. In looking at the delivery of the Plan we will look at the individual delivery of brownfield land over the Plan period.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed, at this time..</b></p> <p>The evidence is that smaller sites have still been delivered despite the changes to the market. That is a factual position evidenced by monitoring. Small sites are often tailored to individual circumstances and not affected as much by wider market conditions.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Agree; they have been considered within the Green belt Assessment..</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Agree, this is reflected in the site assessment criteria.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>LP1 Policy ENV1 agrees to a review of the Green Belt in order to be able to assess whether changes were needed were there to be the exceptional circumstances required to justify changes through the Plan making process. The allocation of sites in green belt or the allocation of more</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The revised settlement boundaries should incorporate proposed site allocations and extant planning permissions within defined settlement boundaries.</li> <li>Object to para 6.1 of the methodology, which indicates that where there may be high development pressure in open countryside that land may be designated as Green Belt.</li> <li>Concern that the Part 2 Plan assesses all designations in the Plan including Protected Areas under 3A and Sites of Settlement Character under Policy 12.</li> </ul>	<p>Green Belt land would need to be based on the emerging evidence base and the right choices for the development needs and environmental considerations for the Borough. At this stage the evidence base is still being prepared and no exceptional circumstances have thus far been identified.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The general position will be that proposed allocations are located within settlement limits. Where allocations are located outside existing settlement boundaries, those boundaries will be amended to bring the allocation within the settlement boundary, providing that they are in a location where extending the settlement limits lines-up with other allocations and does not present a disjointed settlement limit. There may therefore be exceptions to the general presumption of including both within the settlement limits.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Agree.</p> <p><b>Action: The wording will be altered to reflect there being a need for any changes to have exceptional circumstances demonstrated and that the land serves the purposes of green belt set out in the Framework.</b></p> <p>LP2 will review all policy designations including Protected Areas and Sites of Settlement Character.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p>
C032SRM	01476	Steven Abbott Associates LLP Mr Steven Abbott on behalf of: James Begley & Sons Mr & Mrs J & B Begley	<p>This is an extensive representation, which can be viewed in full online. The following is a summary of the key points raised in the Planning Overview Statement and addressed in the column headed Officer / Council Response. A significant amount of technical evidence has also been submitted and this will be considered at the site assessment stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 1 – Introduction</li> <li>Chapter 2 – Background</li> </ul>	<p>These chapters establish the context and history of the site. The comments are noted and will be considered as part of</p>

[illegible]

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>Para 8.15 – The term over-development is misused and given the difficulty in identifying sufficient land for new houses the deduction of existing commitments from individual settlements is questioned.</p> <p>Para 8.17 – LP2 paragraph 5.11 does not list the current Call for Sites exercise, which would identify new opportunities not previously promoted.</p> <p>Para 8.18 – The wording in LP2 paragraph 5.12 is too conservative.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 0.3: We disagree that sites on the edge of Local Service Centre settlement should be scored the same as one within a Rural Service Centre.</p>	<p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Existing commitments need to be accounted for in the proposed housing figures for each settlement as they contribute to the housing supply. Para 3.63 makes clear that should these commitments not come forward then alternative land will need to be made available. This will be form part of the flexibility factor.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>A more detailed reference to the third Call for Sites exercise and the outcome of the Green Belt Assessment, which could potentially identify new sites for development is included in the following paragraph.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p><b>Agreed. The possible need to identify Green Belt sites for development during the plan period is acknowledged. The paragraph will be re-worded to say:</b></p> <p><i>“As part of the preparation of the LP2, and ahead of the public consultation on the Preferred Options Report, the Council will conduct a third and final Call for Sites, which may identify further sites not previously promoted. In addition, the Pendle Green Belt Assessment may also highlight sites that no longer perform a Green Belt Function and may be suitable for development during the plan period. The Assessment may also indicate that one or more of the Policy 3A Protected Sites, adjacent to settlements in the borough, may be required for development beyond the plan period.</i></p> <p>Agree.</p> <p><b>Action: Amend Criterion 0.3 to reflect that sites on the edge of a Local Service Centre are should be scored more favourably than proposed at present.</b></p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 0.4: Greenfield on the edge of M65 Corridor urban areas should score more highly than elsewhere again on the basis of accessibility and sustainability. Similarly, sites which are a mixture of previously developed land and greenfield should score more highly where on the edge of M65 corridor urban areas than those elsewhere.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 1.3: It is wholly inappropriate to score sites more highly because a developer or agency known to undertake development is involved. We are astonished to see that suggestion and do not understand why the Council think it appropriate.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criteria 1.5 and 1.6: We do not understand at all why an historic development plan notation or extant planning permission should score more highly than a new opportunity. Our client's site is good example of an excellent opportunity emerging because of the current circumstances and nothing to do with history i.e. it has not been promoted as seriously as now, previously. There are good reasons why unspent permissions or old allocations are unspent and 'old'. It is unwise to assume that either are good prospects and particularly at the expense of genuine, new opportunities.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 2.6: We disagree that active marketing should feature as a criterion and do not understand why it appears. It is surely immaterial to an objective assessment of the options. We do agree that a site which has been unsuccessfully marketed for a considerable period of time could be given a low score but that is a different matter.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 3.4: The absence of onsite infrastructure should not receive such a low score as most sites do not have what is needed for new development. What matters more is the ability to connect into existing off site infrastructure and the feasibility of providing on site infrastructure. Otherwise, good sites will be marked down in favour of relatively poor sites.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 3.10: The presence of TPOs on sites should not, in itself, produce such a low score. By way of example, the subject site has TPOs on the periphery. The site is large enough for them not to be</p>	<p>The determination of a site's sustainability comes from the assessment of the site against a wide range of criteria of which 0.4 is just one example.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>This knowledge helps to determine if early delivery on the site is a realistic proposition.</p> <p><b>Action None proposed.</b></p> <p>If a site is allocated or has a valid permission for housing it can be reasonably expected that development can proceed without undue delay. An alternative site designation may mean that housing development is not feasible, or that the determination of any planning application is likely to be delayed. This delay may be significant on Green Belt sites, as the application is likely to be called in by the Secretary of State.</p> <p><b>Action None proposed.</b></p> <p>Sites that are actively marketed are considered to be more readily available for development than those that are not. The scoring of other criteria (e.g. 1.5 and 1.6) will downgrade those sites that are not allocated for housing and/or do not have a valid planning permission in place.</p> <p><b>Action None proposed.</b></p> <p>The scoring here is intended to reflect the preference for using previously developed land in sustainable urban locations, rather than remote Greenfield sites.</p> <p><b>Action None proposed.</b></p> <p>Agree. Whilst the presence of TPOs is considered to be a legitimate consideration, it would be better to score the sites 4, 3 and 2 points to reflect that development on the site need not be materially affected by the presence of the</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>adversely affected and indeed their presence ensures a maturity to the landscape from the outset. A better question might be to ask whether TPOs would be materially affected or lost.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 3.11: ‘Agricultural Land’ needs clarity as there is a distinct difference between that in active use on a viable farm unit to that being used, for example, for horse grazing on the urban fringe. The question could be enhanced by asking if the land relates to an active agricultural unit involved in a trade or business in that sphere in the same way agricultural PD rights are related to such units.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 3.12: This question should be expanded to take account of the review in terms of its relationship with settlement boundaries in the M65 Corridor and current purpose in Green Belt terms. The simple question posed in the draft is far too simplistic and will prevent the Council from any sensitivity testing about such land.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 3.18: We question whether the adjacency of a conservation area per se should result in a lower score. The questions should be amended such that the material impact on setting is a determinative aspect. Conservation areas and listed buildings should have separate questions and not treated evenly given their respective status and roles. Archaeology should also be treated separately for the same reason.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Section ‘F’ appears for too subjective and simplistic to stand the test scrutiny and could undermine the soundness of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criteria 3.29 to 3.30: We question why the distance from a motorway is a criterion at all, given the role of motorways. We are also</p>	<p>TPO.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The criterion is seeking to address the quality of the agricultural land, not its viability for different uses.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The question allows the Council to make a clear distinction between sites that are not within the Green Belt and those that are. Under normal circumstances, those outside the Green Belt should be the preferred location for new development, whilst unless exceptional circumstances can be shown to exist, those in a Green Belt setting should remain undeveloped in order to maintain their openness.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>The impact of new development on the setting of a Conservation Area is a material consideration and should be reflected in the scoring of potential site allocations. Whilst it is agreed that each type of ‘heritage asset’ could have its own separate question, this criterion has been carefully constructed to score the relative importance of each factor within one question. There has been no objection to this approach from Historic England.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Agree, in part.</p> <p><b>Action: Review the wording for the assessment of Criterion 3.28.</b></p> <p>Access to the motorway is an important consideration for employment sites, which are also considered through the site assessment process. Access to a motorway junction</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>mindful that LP2 should not be picking the best sites for commuters travelling out of Pendle to other places. The distance from a principal 'A' on secondary 'B' road is better.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 3.34: The reference to 'superstore' should be amended to 'supermarket or larger store'. For example Booths in Barrowford is a supermarket capable of meeting everyday needs.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 3.37: This should include a reference to higher/tertiary and adult education.</p> <p>Para 8.38 – Criterion 3.40: Medical centres should be listed (they are not necessarily doctor's surgeries or hospitals).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 9 – Housing Land Availability</li> </ul> <p>Para 9.2 – The site identified in the SHLAA is smaller than the site identified now, which includes previously developed land.</p>	<p>also facilitates movement within the borough, important for residents looking for good access to retail and employment opportunities. Scoring sites against all the criteria, together with the careful consideration of the results under each sub-heading, provides a balanced view on the overall suitability of a site for the proposed use.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed.</b></p> <p>Agree.</p> <p><b>Action: Criterion to be reworded:</b>  <i>"Ease of access to nearest large supermarket or superstore." (e.g. Booths, Sainsbury's, Asda etc.)</i></p> <p>There is only one college offering sixth form and tertiary education in Pendle. As such access to sixth form and tertiary education is not a critical factor in determining the sustainability of sites on a borough-wide basis. Housing needs to be distributed across Pendle, so scoring the proximity of sites to the nearest college would only serve to distort the results.</p> <p><b>Action: None proposed:</b></p> <p>Whilst the current terminology "Ease of access to nearest doctor's surgery or health centre" is considered to offer sufficient guidance, to avoid the possibility for confusion additional wording is proposed, as follows.</p> <p><b>Action: Criterion to be reworded:</b>  <i>"Ease of access to nearest doctors surgery, health centre or medical centre."</i></p> <p>The description in the SHLAA will be updated as appropriate to reflect the current proposal. The comment does not directly affect the content of the LP Scoping Report &amp; Methodology.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<p>Para 9.3 – The Council concludes that it has a five year supply ... but it is quite possible that the estimates are at least two years out of step.</p> <p>Para 9.7 – The site should no longer be identified as a long-term option as its availability is now more immediate.</p> <p>Para 9.8 – The description of the site within the SHLAA contains errors that need correcting immediately.</p> <p>Para 9.9 – The description in the site record (S247) contains errors that need correcting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 10 – Infrastructure</li> <li>• Chapter 11 – Council Land</li> <li>• Chapter 12 – Education</li> <li>• Chapter 13 – Other Community Facilities</li> <li>• Chapter 16 – Conclusions</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 15 – Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>The five-year housing land supply figure is updated annually in the Authority’s Monitoring Report (AMR). The comment does not directly affect the content of the LP Scoping Report &amp; Methodology.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>The description in the SHLAA will be updated as appropriate to reflect the current proposal. The comment does not directly affect the content of the LP Scoping Report &amp; Methodology.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>The description in the SHLAA does not contain errors, as stated, but requires updating based on the newly available information. The description in the SHLAA will be updated as appropriate to reflect the current proposal.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>The description in the site record does not contain errors, as stated, but requires updating based on the newly available information. The description in the site record will be updated as appropriate to reflect the current proposal.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>These chapters provide additional contextual information relating to the site at Higher Park Farm. The comments are noted and will be considered as part of the site assessment process.</p> <p><b>Action: None required.</b></p> <p>Comments in these chapters do not relate to the content of the LP2 Scoping Report &amp; Methodology.</p>



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (Reproduced verbatim so may contain typographical errors etc.)	Officer / Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 14 – Housing White Paper</li> </ul>	<b>Action: None required.</b>