



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

### Site Comments

#### Consultation Comments


Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Site Ref	Comments	Officer / Council Response
C001SC	01498	Mr Timothy Pigott	P240	<p>It has been brought to my attention that as part of the new Pendle Local Plan that site P240 has been put forward for consideration to be included in the potential development sites. I would like to remind you that this site did apply for planning permission but was then withdrawn following the flood risk assessment. I refer you to the attached photographs highlighting the effect of standard winter rainfall on the field and the flooding which affects the adjacent road (which is elevated in relation to the field). This land is not appropriate for development. The neighbouring brownfield sites of Fernbank mill and 'the old ambulance station' are however certainly appropriate development sites, which would not add to the flood risk to the adjacent properties.</p> <p>Land off Brogden Lane P240 during the winter. Main body of water is site P240, feeder flood areas are adjacent fields.</p> 	<p>Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to comment.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Site Ref	Comments	Officer / Council Response
				<p data-bbox="725 169 1144 196">Brodden lane during any heavy rainfall</p> 	
C002SC	01500	Mr Stephen Myers	P240	<p data-bbox="725 1326 1579 1385">I wish to object to the inclusion of proposed site P240, in the new Pendle Local Plan2 proposals.</p> <p data-bbox="725 1425 1579 1481">A previous Planning Application was objected to by Lancashire County Council flood management team on the grounds of the unsuitable flood risk proposals.</p>	<p data-bbox="1592 1326 2184 1481">Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Site Ref	Comments	Officer / Council Response
				<p>This site regularly floods and has done for many, many years, development will risk this flood water to move to adjacent residences.</p> <p>The area is outside the local settlement boundary, which is there to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>There are still many brownfield sites around Barnoldswick which should be developed before even considering encroaching into the countryside.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to this particular site (P240) and urge you to reconsider this proposal.</p>	<p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to comment.</p>
C003SC	01502	Mr Les Roberts	P240	<p>I understand that land off Brogden Land and Brogden View in Barnoldswick have been included in the potential development sites within the Pendle local plan.</p> <p>I would like to inform you of the great issues that there are on this site regarding flooding of the field and Brogden Lane itself.</p> <p>The land lies some distance below broaden Lane and would, if included in the plan, need to be drained We have been residents here for 29 years and the field floods and remains flooded for long period of a time in the winter months.</p> <p>The proposed area would also break the settlement boundary of Barnoldswick - and once this is done, there is no return. The fantastic countryside, used for all manner of leisure activities would be lost for good and for future generations to enjoy.</p> <p>Surely the old ambulance site, on Brogden View, and the area on Fernbank mill- as brown field sites would be a better option to develop?</p>	<p>Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to comment.</p>
C004SC	01502	Mr Les Roberts	P055	<p>I understand that land off Foster Road in Barnoldswick has been earmarked to be included in the Pendle Development plan.</p> <p>If this area was included as par of the development plan it would impact on the settlement boundary of Barnoldswick and move development into a greenfield site.</p> <p>Once this is done, this countryside would be lost forever and the use by local residents for leisure and relaxation gone.</p>	<p>Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to comment.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Site Ref	Comments	Officer / Council Response
				<p>Indeed, as part of Pendle's Development plan - there is a section written regarding a commitment to protecting green open spaces- surely this in one of them - and to develop would reduce the amount of green spaces on the periphery of the town</p> <p>The area is also poorly serviced by road access</p> <p>There is an additional are (proposed site P 240) - land off Broaden Lane, which is directly adjacent to this land. Rainfall drains from site PO55 to site P240 and in the winter, site P240 is often flooded for long periods of time. In fact- the land looks something like a seasonal wetland.</p> <p>A lot of work on infrastructure would need to be implemented to ensure flood risk was managed well.</p>	
C005SC	00639	Dr Alison Birkinshaw	P002; P005; P009	<p>I would like to protest in the strongest terms regarding the proposed allocation of sites P002, P005 and P009 as sites suitable for housing. As planning authorities will be aware, the Land off Windermere Avenue, locally known as The Rough has recently been the subject of a planning application and appeal. Although the planning application was partially successful, the remainder of The Rough was identified as not being suitable for development and turned down by appeal.</p> <p>Therefore I would formally request that all the letters and responses to that consultation event, and the responses to the appeal should be taken into consideration when considering these parcels of land as appropriate for housing, together with the Appeal findings themselves. It would not be appropriate for these parcels of land to be considered for housing without taking into account the wholesale rejection of these proposals by local residents and the findings of the Planning Inspector.</p> <p>Additionally, much of the proposed land falls into a conservation area (Lidgett Triangle) and should be protected as green field/environmentally sensitive land.</p> <p>I would request that you confirm that you will take into account residents views and responses over the recent consultation and planning applications regarding the development of The Rough.</p>	<p>Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to comment.</p>
C006SC	01504	Mr & Mrs Brent & Virginia Fielden	P240	<p>We object vehemently to site P240 being considered for building for the following points</p>	

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Site Ref	Comments	Officer / Council Response
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This site has always been a natural flood plain, the field regularly floods to such an extent that during periods of heavy rain it is like a lake.</li> <li>2. As residents living adjacent to the site we have grave concerns that any development will displace the flood water onto our and other property.</li> <li>3. Brogden Lane adjacent to this site also regularly floods, any displacement due to building work could exacerbate the flooding.</li> <li>4. Brogden Lane is the site of an old Roman road, many people enjoy walking with their families on the flat part of the lane adjacent to the site. The views and tranquility are enjoyed by these people, development of this site will surely spoil this for many, many people.</li> <li>5. Brogden Lane particularly the area close to the proposed development is a quiet single track country lane which is popular with walkers, cyclists, horse riders and young families. The increase in traffic caused by development of the site would have a huge impact on the safety, tranquility and enjoyment of the lane for all these people.</li> <li>6. Brogden. Lane with the junction of Gisburn Road is a difficult and dangerous junction to exit, increased traffic from developing this site would surely only increase the danger. Numerous accidents have occurred at this junction.</li> <li>7. The proposed site is a haven for wildlife, including bats, owls and amphibious creatures and hedgehogs, development of the site would endanger their habitat.</li> </ol>	
C007SC	01506	Marie Lonsdale	P005	<p>What is going on with this planning application. Why don't these "people " who make wide ranging decisions that affect people's lives listen to local residents, many of whom have lived in the area all their lives. Surely they know much, much more about their local area than strangers who pop in for a day.</p>	<p>Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to comment.</p>
C008SC	01530	Ms Shelagh Thake	P240	<p>I understand that as part of the new Pendle Local Plan a field off Brogden Lane, Barnoldswick has been included as a potential development site. It is listed as site number P240.</p> <p>I wish to register my strong objection to this site being included, firstly because it is outside the settlement line for Barnoldswick and secondly because this field periodically floods on a regular basis (please see photograph attached). Not only does the field flood but also Brogden Lane which gives access to the field. On two occasions this winter the road was so flooded it</p>	<p>Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Site Ref	Comments	Officer / Council Response
				<p>became impassable to motor vehicles.</p> <p>This site previously had a planning application submitted and it was withdrawn as a consequence of the flood risk assessment by Lancashire Country Council Flood Risk assessment team.</p> <p>I would recommend that this site is rejected from the proposed list of sites.</p> 	comment.
C009SC	01185	Dr J D & Mrs AM Plackett	P227	<p>This area of land includes P226, which we have also commented on.</p> <p>We propose Gib Hill site P227 as part of an emerging coherent ecological network.</p> <p>We propose Gib Hill site P227 as Local Green Space</p> <p>It meets the criteria listed in the NPPF para77.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is close to the community it serves. See (site A) Site P227 map.</li> <li>2. It is valued by local residents who use it for walking in the fresh air, running, dog walking, photography, peacefully enjoying views from the hillside, especially of Pendle Hill, watching nature etc. When the Local Plan was</li> </ol>	<p>Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to comment.</p>

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Site Ref	Comments	Officer / Council Response
				<p>review in 2006 over 400 residents filled in card supporting the continuing existence of the hillside as a local asset.</p> <p>3. Its landscape, as an Area of Special Landscape Character is local in character, with hedges bounding small fields of traditionally farmed grazing land.</p> <p>4. With an area of just over 12 hectares, it is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>The land slopes down from the Marsden Park Gold Course. The field boundaries are mostly hedges, the main one comprises a double hedge on either side of an historic land, Bott Lane, which runs from top to bottom of the site. The hedge is made up of a good mix of native tree species with around 50% of which is Holly. It is likely to be a Hedgerow of Importance --- Hedgerow Regulations.</p> <p>With four streams and numerous issues – springs and flushes – due to underlying geology, this site is inclined to seepage especially in winter and spells of heavy rainfall. The soil profiles and binding root structures in these old meadows and mature hedgerows have the natural ability to retain soils and ground water and slowly release their water burden, retaining the resilience to flooding. Housing development proposed for this site is likely to decrease the water retaining capacity of this site, decreasing the resilience to flooding.</p> <p>The water in the ditch between the golf course and the Gib Hill fields is discolouring indicating rusting iron. This water drains on to the Gib Hill fields. As far as is known, no tests have been carried out on this water to ascertain if there are any contaminants, as reputedly, a unrecorded landfill site exists in this area. However, it is known by soil analysis in the area, raised levels of arsenic have been noted.</p> <p>Blocks of native woodland trees planted with forestry grants in two phases on the site complement the long established native tree species growing along the field boundaries and watercourses. These blocks of trees, now flowering and seeding, contribute to Pendle Borough Council's (PBC) commitment to create new native woodland. These developing woodlands are creating a habitat mosaic and contributing to the emerging coherent ecological network.</p> <p>This Biological Heritage Site – BHS, priority habitat and Local Site (fields 462, 461 and 750), represent areas of substantive natural history conservation value and fields 748 and 749 when adopted as recommended in the BHS</p>	



Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Site Ref	Comments	Officer / Council Response
				<p>report as an area of Local Natural Interest – LNI – together demonstrate an area rich in wildlife.</p> <p>We endorse this nominated site as a Local Nature Reserve.</p>	
C010SC	01185	Dr J D & Mrs AM Plackett	P238	<p>Gib Hill, Site A and Gib Hill , SiteB – P238 are largely similar with small variations in the north-west area of each site and the inclusion/exclusion of parts of field nos. 462 401, 750 and 787. So comments, proposals and endorsement about Site A apply also to this site.</p> <p>We oppose housing development on this site.</p> <p>Finally, if HMR has finished, why does the designation still exist and why has the settlement boundary not been moved back to its pre-2006 position?</p>	<p>Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to comment.</p>
C011SC	01185	Dr J D & Mrs AM Plackett	P226	<p>We endorse the nominated site P226 as an environmental site for the following reasons proposed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This site should be part of a Local Nature Reserve (LNR), incorporating fields 401, 462 and 750 adjacent to site P226. These 3 fields form a biological Heritage Site (BHS)- priority habitat – of county and regional importance. They also have Local Site status – an area of substantive nature conservation value – and have already been proposed as an LNR by the Council Executive on two occasions, but its realisation has been blocked. This executive decisions needs to be enacted.</li> <li>2. The whole of site C was surveyed by John Lamb of the Lancashire Wildlife Trust who found the flora in the field 748 and 749 to be of BHS standard, but reluctantly the BHS panel recommended LNI status despite the lower parts of both fields, around 50% by area, possessing the higher BHS standard. These fields should be awarded LNI status and habitat restoration undertaken as recommended in the BHS panel’s report.</li> </ol> <p>We propose this site as part of the emerging coherent ecological network.</p> <p>We propose this site as par of the designation Local Green Space (NPPF para77).</p> <p>We endorse this nominated site as part of Local Nature Reserve.</p>	<p>Comments on previously submitted sites did not form part of the recent public consultation. Therefore, the Council will not provide a detailed response to this comment at this stage. The information provided will be considered during the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Once the Council has prepared a draft version of the Local Plan and identified its preferred site allocations, there will be a further opportunity for the public to comment.</p>