

West Craven Committee – 8th November 2016

Update Report

16/0477/FUL – Rolls Royce, Barnoldswick

No further information received at this stage – **recommend deferral** of the application to allow time for details to come forward and to be fully considered.

16/0597/OUT – Greenberfield Lane/Gisburn Road, Barnoldswick

One further public response received, raising the following objections;

- Concerns remain the same despite amendments
- Overspill traffic cannot be accommodated
- Large increase in traffic using area – acts as an alternative route when other roads are busy/blocked
- Poor visibility and several recent incidents
- Speeding vehicles and additional traffic would lead to fatalities
- Land has flooded and development will cause problems elsewhere
- Impact on bats
- Structure of roads cannot be altered due to protection of ancient lane
- Inaccessibility to information by residents – unclear what changes had been made or whether further objections were needed.
- Information difficult to find on the Council's website

16/0630/OUT Land at Field No. 0087 Earby Road Salterforth

Comments received from LLFA – No objection subject to appropriate conditions to control scheme to be submitted and management and maintenance plans.

Comments received from Earby Town Council:

An in-depth discussion ensued and the following grounds for objection put forward:

- a) Road Safety – Concerns about the proposed paths and the narrowness, being 40cm wide. The width of a baby buggy or pram with someone pushing it is wider than this. Also two children walking side by side as in a crocodile are wider than this. The width and sighting of the proposed paths are totally inadequate. There are no connecting footpaths into towns/villages posing a major threat to foot traffic.
- b) Traffic Issues – The access, egress and line of sight are very poor, particularly on a road that is a well-known black spot where deaths have occurred
- c) There is a special bus laid on to take children to Salterforth School due to the route being unsafe.
- d) The proposed crossing is in a dangerous place and still means crossing a busy road. Examining the plans it appears that the line of sight is being made

worse. Have any measurements actually been done on the ground and compared to those stated on the plans?

These are council's main but not only concerns. The following were made known on the objection to the original proposal:

The infrastructure is at or near saturation point, particularly the water and sewage systems.

This was illustrated dramatically over the Christmas/New Year period in Earby where the flooding caused widespread disruption and much damage.

This will be made worse when the development at the old Silentnight site comes on line and worse still if the nearby mill site on the outskirts of Barnoldswick is successful at appeal.

Schools, doctor's surgeries, pharmacies etc. are stretched to full capacity given the many developments recently undertaken in both Salterforth and Earby.

There are brownfield sites in the area available for development so there is no need to build here.

Council see this as overdevelopment and outside the settlement boundary.

One further comment received objecting on the following grounds:

- The road is not suitable and has difficult junctions and this is without the large Seddon Homes Development which is not yet finished;
- I fail to see that the minor changes on the plans would alleviate these issues or make the road safer for pedestrians;
- The road is used by many walkers/ramblers etc. and it is used as a shortcut for workers in Earby and Barnoldswick;
- The gradient of the land would need extreme management to avoid higher flood risk and also result in overshadowing inhabitants of Kennilworth Drive;
- Disruption to historic trees and hedgerows will change the character of the area;
- Amount of noise and air pollution would be high;
- The Greenbelt between Earby and Salterforth would be eroded;
- None of the initial issues have been addressed;
- The footpath supposes that all traffic will travel to Earby which is not the case;
- There is a need for more affordable housing.

These issues have been addressed in the report and the recommendation for approval subject to appropriate conditions remains.

Publicity expires on the 9th November and therefore **the recommendation should be Delegate Grant Consent.**