



*dynamic development solutions™*



**Pendle Borough Council  
Green Belt Assessment**

Prepared by  
Alex Roberts  
**DLP Planning Ltd**  
Sheffield

September 2016

Prepared by:



Alex Roberts,  
Associate Director

Approved by:



Paul Jobson, Director

Date:

September 2016

**DLP Planning Ltd**  
Ground Floor  
V1 Velocity  
Tenter Street  
Sheffield  
S1 4BY

Tel: 01142 289190  
Fax: 01142 721947

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>0.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>5</b>
Mapping	6
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>7</b>
History of the Green Belt in Pendle	7
Emerging Local Plan	8
The Green Belt Assessment Brief	9
<b>2.0 Methodology</b>	<b>9</b>
Identification of Land Parcels	10
Criteria for determining strong boundaries	12
Methodology for implementing the criteria	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Stage 1	14
Stage 2	14
Stage 3	14
Appraisal of Land Parcels	14
Assessment criteria for Green Belt land parcels	15
<b>Purpose 1:</b> To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.	17
<b>Purpose 2:</b> To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another	20
<b>Purpose 3:</b> To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	23
<b>Purpose 4:</b> To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	26
<b>Purpose 5:</b> To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict land	28
Urban Edge Assessment	28
<b>3.0 Strategic Overview of the Green Belt in Pendle</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4.0 Identification of Green Belt Parcels</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5.0 Assessment of Green Belt Parcels</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>6.0 Conclusions</b>	<b>40</b>
Exceptional Circumstances	43
<b>7.0 Green Belt Parcel Records</b>	<b>44</b>

## **0.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

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

addition to this, extending existing Green Belt boundaries in some areas will be considered. Therefore the assessment must be able to stand up to scrutiny through public consultation and crucially through independent examination.

### **Mapping**

0.6 Appendix 2 of this assessment sets out the mapping used to identify the different land parcels and the thematic maps which correspond with the assessment tables. The maps in appendix 2 are:

DRAFT

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### History of the Green Belt in Pendle

- 1.1 The establishment and maintenance of Green Belt around many of the largest urban areas in England has long been part of national planning policy, with the aim being to protect open countryside from the pressure of development by restricting the expansion of towns and villages and thereby inhibiting 'urban sprawl'.
- 1.2 Legislation for the establishment and maintenance of Green Belts was introduced in the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947, then in 1955 through circular 42/55 the principle was extended beyond London.
- 1.3 The North East Lancashire Structure Plan (1979) was the first planning document to identify areas in Pendle Borough for inclusion in the Green Belt:
- Green Belts will be established between or adjacent to the following settlements:*
- (i) *Between... Padiham and Burnley (north of A671), Colne and Trawden, Colne and Foulridge*
- 1.4 The draft Lancashire Structure Plan (1987) identified more specific areas:
- To maintain Green Belts in the following areas:*
- (g) *... between Padiham/Burnley and Barrowford, Nelson and Barrowford, Barrowford and Colne, Colne and Trawden, Colne and Foulridge, Colne and Laneshaw Bridge*
- 1.5 Subsequently the general extent of the Green Belt in Lancashire was finally established in Policy 17 of the Lancashire Structure Plan, approved by the Secretary of State for the Environment in December 1989 which came into effect on 4 January 1990.
- 1.6 It was not until 1999 through the adoption of the Pendle Local Plan that the detailed boundaries for the Green Belt within Pendle were formally designated. There have been no reviews of the general extent of the Green Belt in Pendle since this date.

However through the recently adopted Core Strategy, approximately 30 hectares of land at Wheatley Laith (immediately west of the Lomeshaye Industrial Estate, Nelson) was removed from the Green Belt to provide land for strategic employment needs.

- 1.7 Currently a total of 2,036 hectares of Pendle is currently designated as Green Belt, which is approximately 12% of the Borough.

### **Emerging Local Plan**

- 1.8 The Council's Core Strategy, which was adopted on 17 December 2015 set out the Borough's growth aspirations and spatial development needs. The Council's adopted strategy for the distribution of growth in Pendle sets certain proportions across all settlements.
- 1.9 Within the Core Strategy's 'Inspector's report', it is stated in paragraph 41 that the general extent of the Green Belt should remain. But that a detailed review of the Green Belt boundary around settlements in the Site Allocations Plan [the emerging plan] is needed to determine if the boundary should change to include additional land for development.
- 1.10 Importantly the Inspector set out that the review should include the Rural Service Centres within the Green Belt (Fence, Fourlridge and Trawden) as 12% of housing should be delivered in Rural Pendle.

*It would appear to me that the Green Belt review will be necessary to ensure that enough land is identified to meet the spatial strategy of the Plan*

- 1.11 This Green Belt assessment will form part of the evidence base for the emerging Site Allocations Plan.



### **The Green Belt Assessment Brief**

- 1.12 The brief prepared by Pendle Borough Council splits the assessment of the Green Belt into five stages. We have grouped these together into three elements:
- i. **Stage 1 & 2** – Methodology, Strategic Overview and Land Parcel Identification
  - ii. **Stage 3 & 4** – Detailed Review of the Green Belt and Deliverability Assessment
  - iii. **Stage 5** – Reporting
- 1.13 This document reports the outputs of the brief, a standalone report for Stage 1 & 2 was prepared for the methodology consultation in May 2016. Subsequently a summary document of the consultation was made available by the Council on their website (Appendix 1 and 2).

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

- 2.1 The methodology used to identify land parcels within the Green Belt along with any extensions to the Green Belt, plus the methodology to assess each parcel for its performance against the 5 purposes of Green Belt was prepared in conformity with the Framework, best practice and from the consultant team's experience. The method and approach were made available for public consultation during May and June 2016.
- 2.2 In addition to the public consultation a consultation workshop was held on Thursday 2 June 2016, which brought together those individuals and organisations the Council considered to be key stakeholders (Appendix 1).
- 2.3 Following the consultation, 'minor roads with a particularly strong hedgerow' was added to the 'Strong Boundaries' category. No other changes to either part of the methodology were made.

### **Identification of Land Parcels**

- 2.4 The Green Belt was divided into suitable and clearly defined parcels of land; we also considered identifying some smaller more focused parcels of land close to the existing settlement boundaries, where it would be anticipated the pressure for development would be greater. The current Green Belt has been divided into 66 identifiable parcels of land.
- 2.5 In addition to identifying parcels of land within the Green Belt we also considered areas beyond the current Green Belt boundary which may fulfil the exceptional circumstances required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to be designated as Green Belt. In total 5 possible additions to the Green Belt were identified.

2.6 Furthermore, the 3 Protected Areas saved by Policy 3A of the 'Replacement Pendle Local Plan 2001 - 2016' and defined on the Proposals Map, also formed part of the Green Belt assessment. The supporting text for the policy (paragraph 3A.2) states that:

*It is intended that these areas should remain open during the plan period. They represent areas of choice for possible development to meet future long term requirements and to ensure the protection of the Green Belt. The future of these areas is to be re-examined through subsequent reviews of the Plan. Should long term pressure for development after 2016 prove that the areas will not be required for development, consideration will be given to their inclusion within the Green Belt.*

2.7 A total of 74 parcels of land have been identified for assessment. These are set out in Tables 7-9 inclusive.

2.8 The NPPF (paragraph 85) makes it clear that Green Belt boundaries should be robust and permanent. Therefore strong boundaries (which make sense on the ground), must be used.

2.9 The process applied for the identification of land parcels is set out below:

- a) The area of Green Belt to which the assessment will be applied was agreed with the Council.
- b) The draft set of criteria for determining the strong boundaries used for the land parcels to be assessed was drawn from national policy, best practice and previous experience was utilised.
- c) The draft methodology for implementing the assessment criteria was prepared. The method comprised of a desktop assessment of the Green Belt using the agreed criteria, followed by site visits to check the land parcel boundaries and provide a final review for consistency.

- d) The draft criteria and methodology were made available for consultation with key stakeholders and presented for discussion at the workshop held on Thursday 2 June 2016.
- e) All reasonable suggestions were considered, with one alteration made to the criteria for strong boundaries.
- f) Following the Council officer's acceptance of the assessment criteria and methodology, the identification of land parcels was carried out with site visits taking place the week commencing Monday 1 August 2016.

*Criteria for determining strong boundaries*

- 2.10 Paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. Such boundaries are more likely to withstand the passage of time and are therefore appropriate in identifying the boundaries of the parcels within this assessment.
- 2.11 The criteria used in the assessment are set out in Table 1.

**Table 1**      **Criteria for strong boundaries**

<b>Strong Boundaries</b>	<b>Moderate to Weak Boundaries</b>
Motorway Main or minor road, particularly with hedgerow alongside	Minor or private road with open edge to countryside
Railway line (in use)	Disused railway lines
Rivers, streams and canals	Brooks and culverted watercourses
Protected or dense woodland	Non-protected woodlands, trees and hedges
<b>Strong Boundaries</b>	<b>Moderate to Weak Boundaries</b>
Protected or tall hedgerows	Field or open space boundaries, not well defined by mature vegetation
Residential, employment or other development with strong established boundaries (such as tall walls and mature vegetation)	Residential, employment or other development with weak or intermediate established boundaries (such as low walls, timber fences, open boundaries or immature vegetation)
Prominent topography	Power lines
	Public footpath

*Methodology for implementing the criteria*

2.12 Following the agreement of the criteria for establishing strong boundaries, the three stages set out below were undertaken to determine the Green Belt Parcels for assessment.

*Stage 1*

2.13 All mapping and other relevant information was brought together into a comprehensive GIS workspace.

*Stage 2*

2.14 A desktop based assessment using the criteria to identify suitable land parcels was carried out by the team. This formed an initial view of the proposed parcels.

*Stage 3*

2.15 Site visits were undertaken to ensure that the proposed boundaries met with the defined criteria. Inconsistency or errors were identified and changes considered. In some instances parcels were sub-divided, these can be identified by the denotation of; a, b, c, etc.

**Appraisal of Land Parcels**

2.16 To summarise, the appraisal of land parcels was carried out on:

- identified Green Belt parcels,
- potential areas currently outside of the defined Green Belt; and
- land currently identified as Protected Areas

2.17 It was essential that the appraisal used to assess the land parcels was robust, conforms to national policy and guidance and took into account best practice, so that meaningful conclusions could be reached on each land parcel assessed. Therefore, a clear and transparent appraisal methodology was essential.

2.18 The methodology for the appraisal of land parcels was as follows:

- a) A draft set of assessment criteria and scoring system were prepared – this used the five purposes of Green Belt as set out in the NPPF as a starting point and drew on best practice and past experience.
- b) A draft methodology for carrying out the assessment was prepared: the method consisted of an initial desktop assessment followed by site visits to each land parcel and a final desktop review.
- c) The draft methodology and draft assessment criteria were made available for consultation and presented for discussion at the stakeholder workshop.
- d) All reasonable suggestions were considered, but no alterations were made.
- e) Following the acceptance of the assessment criteria, assessment matrix, methodology and the Green Belt and other land parcels by officers of Pendle Council, the detailed assessment was carried out with site visits taking place week commencing 5 September 2016.

*Assessment criteria for Green Belt land parcels*

2.19 The assessment criteria for each Green Belt purpose is set out in tables 2 to 6. These criteria are based upon the five purposes of the Green Belt (NPPF paragraph 80); the objective of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open (NPPF paragraph 79) and maintaining the permanence of Green Belts (NPPF paragraph 83).

2.20 An assessment matrix has been used to assess how each parcel performs against each of the Green Belt purposes to help form a preliminary conclusion on their contribution to the purpose of Green Belt.

2.21 Purpose 5 has not been assessed for each individual land parcel, as it is the overall restrictive nature of the Green Belt that encourages regeneration, not the restriction that it places on specific areas of land. We consider the appropriate basis for the

consideration of this purpose is the wider purpose of the Green Belt as a whole and how it may undermine regeneration due to the oversupply of land.

- 2.22 The principal feature of the methodology is the recognition of ‘critical’ Green Belt purposes. These exist where a single purpose is so fundamental to the retention of areas of land in the Green Belt that this purpose alone justifies maintaining its role as Green Belt.
- 2.23 Previous work has found that it can be extremely difficult to assess specific parcels of land in terms of their performance against the Green Belt purposes; they are simply too generalised, reflecting the strategic nature and aims of Green Belt policy, which is essentially a ‘blunt tool’. To allow more detailed analysis of the way in which land parcels fulfil the Green Belt purposes it is necessary to examine them in further detail.
- 2.24 For each purpose four categories have been defined against which the performance of a particular purpose may be defined for any given parcel of land, based on its ability to accommodate development. These are explained below.
- ‘Critical importance’ to Green Belt Purpose – where land is ‘fundamental’ to the purpose, justifying its continued retention and protection within Green Belt.
  - ‘Major importance’ to Green Belt Purpose – where land is of ‘considerable’ importance to the Green Belt purpose, and where development would conflict substantially with it.
  - ‘Moderate importance’ to Green Belt Purpose – where land is of ‘modest’ importance to the Green Belt purpose, and where development would conflict significantly with it.
  - ‘Slight importance’ to Green Belt Purpose – where land is of ‘minor’ importance to the Green Belt purpose, and where development would have limited or no discernible conflict with it.



2.25 The criteria used for defining the 'categories' within each purpose are outlined in the following sections.

***Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.***

2.26 The sense of permanence provided by Green Belt is fundamental to the limitation of urban sprawl and it is the case that the wholesale restriction that the Green Belt places upon development ensures that the outer expansion of the urban areas remains heavily constrained limiting 'sprawl'. However, well located and planned urban extensions are unlikely to constitute 'sprawl' (a term that is based on negativity suggesting the unplanned, uncontrolled spread of development).

2.27 By virtue of the definition, land that follows the periphery of an urban area is likely to contribute most significantly to this purpose as it is that land that provides the boundary and zone of constraint to urban expansion. The contribution that land makes to this purpose 'falls away' progressively with increasing distance from the urban edge.

2.28 Upon examination it may be that the periphery of settlements has areas where the urban area has expanded to boundaries that are poorly defined. Such boundaries give the perception of a 'poor fit' within the landscape setting and allows poorly designed development to have an extensive influence over adjoining land beyond, with consequential effects on landscape character and the perception of the urban area and its setting. Purpose 1 therefore has a direct relationship with Purpose (safeguarding the countryside from encroachment).

2.29 Such examination will also identify areas where the urban edge is reasonably well-defined by landscape features which in turn provide containment and thereby reduce or avoid the perception of 'sprawl'. Thus, by an examination of the physical and visual attributes of settlement fringes it is possible to determine whether further peripheral growth will be contained and whether it would accord or conflict with this purpose.

2.30 There are also likely to be parts of the Borough where areas of land form a very strong, defined threshold between the edge of the urban area and the outlying

countryside beyond. Such thresholds provide strong physical and visual containment of the urban area and protect the land further afield. These areas would be assessed as being 'critical' to the containment of the urban area, where there are no other similar areas that lie further from the urban edge, which could fulfil a similar function in respect of this purpose, if urban expansion were to take place. Because of their (usually) close relationship to existing settlements, such areas may have a variable landscape character. Given the strategic containment that these areas provide, land that lies between them and the urban edge may be considered to be less important to this purpose.

- 2.31 Elsewhere there may be areas where such thresholds are much less well defined but the land nevertheless still provides a good level of containment around the urban edge, ensuring a reasonable 'fit' of the urban area within its landscape context; these areas would be categorised as being of 'major' importance. There may be other locations, further from the urban edge that have the potential to perform a similar function if the urban area were to expand.
- 2.32 The 'moderate' category would apply to land that does provide some containment to the urban area but where the settlement has a poorly defined edge, and urban related uses may affect the character of the land beyond. There may be other features (such as a major road) that provide an arbitrary boundary (in landscape terms) to the urban edge. In these circumstances the existing Green Belt boundary would not limit the influence of the urban area on adjoining land.
- 2.33 If it is found that the edge of the urban area is poorly contained and has a poorly defined edge in relation to landscape features, or there is a predominance of degraded land, the parcel would be categorised as being of 'negligible' importance with respect to this purpose as the perception of 'sprawl' is already apparent. In such locations there may be opportunities arising from development that would establish a new Green Belt boundary that provides greater containment, a better 'fit' for development, and better respects landscape character. Criteria for the assessment of Purpose 1 are set out in the following table.

**Table 2 Criteria for Green Belt Purpose 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas**

- 1) Does the parcel directly abut the outer edge of the defined settlements, or is it very close to it? Is it part of a wider group of parcels that directly act to prevent urban sprawl?
- 2) Does the Green Belt prevent another settlement being absorbed into the large built-up area?
- 3) What is the physical gap between the settlement edge of the parcel and the urban edge of the defined settlements? (I.e. is there a broad gap or is it narrow at this point?)
- 4) What would be the remaining gap if the land is developed?
- 5) Would development represent an outward extension of the urban area, result in a physical connection between urban areas or lead to the danger of a subsequent coalescence between such settlements?
- 6) If released from the Green Belt could enduring long-term settlement boundaries be established?

<p><b>Critical importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of paramount importance</p>	<p>Critical</p>	<p>Land where development would conflict <b>fundamentally</b> with Green Belt purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land provides a distinct, well-defined threshold between the urban areas within Pendle/other built up area(s) in adjacent districts, and provides strong containment that prevents the perception of 'sprawl'.</li> <li>There are no alternative strong physical/landscape boundaries further from the edge of the urban area that would perform a similar role in containing growth and ensuring a 'good fit' for development - strategic level of development would lead to perception of uncontained growth.</li> <li>The land may/may not be affected already by the existing physical/visual presence of the urban areas and may have a varied character.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Major importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of major importance</p>	<p>Major</p>	<p>Land where development would conflict <b>substantially</b> with Green Belt purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land abuts the urban areas, although its character may be influenced by it.</li> <li>Strategic level of development has potential to create perception of poorly contained growth, although other limited physical/landscape boundaries may exist further from the urban edge that could define and contain growth and prevent the perception of 'sprawl' (although these may require reinforcement to achieve a well-defined limit to development and a new Green Belt boundary).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Moderate importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of moderate importance</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Land where development would conflict <b>significantly</b> with Green Belt purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land provides some containment of the urban area although it is significantly influenced by its presence and related features/land uses leading to a poorly defined edge, or it may be distant from the urban edge and therefore contribute less to the purpose (other land closer to the urban edge performs the function of containment).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Slight/Negligible importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of minor/negligible importance</p>	<p>Slight/ Negligible</p>	<p>Land where development would have <b>limited</b> impact on this purpose of Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land is physically and visually dominated by/related to the urban areas and already perceived to be part of/or closely related to the built form, giving a poorly defined edge and perception of 'sprawl'.</li> <li>Development may allow opportunities for enhancement of degraded land and the definition of a stronger long-term Green Belt boundary.</li> </ul>

**Purpose 2:** *To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another*

- 2.34 The primary function of this purpose is clear – it is to prevent towns that are relatively close together from merging. For this strategic assessment we have assumed that all towns in the study area should remain separate with a clear physical and visual distinction between them, such that they retain their separate identities and setting. We also worked on the basis that, despite the strict definition of the purpose which appears to exclude them, smaller settlements would also be relevant to the purpose. The assessment of the performance of parcels of Green Belt land against this purpose will therefore be informed by landscape and visual assessment to determine the nature and capacity of the intervening land to accommodate a strategic level of development.
- 2.35 In parcels where such development is likely to result in physical coalescence, or at the very least a clearly recognisable perception of merging that would erode the distinct separate identity and character of either/both urban areas, the land would have to be considered ‘critical’ to this purpose and its retention in Green Belt would be regarded as being of paramount importance.
- 2.36 In parcels where there is no significant existing inter-visibility between towns, and where more limited (but not strategic) development may be accommodated without causing merger or the perception of merging, its retention within the Green Belt would be considered to be of ‘major’ importance to this purpose. However, in such areas development may lead to a substantial reduction of the separation between other urban areas, or potential for them to merge.
- 2.37 The performance of the parcels against this purpose will reduce with the increase and/or perception of distance between towns, as not all of the land is likely to be important to maintaining separation. Where a strategic level of development may be accommodated without compromising this purpose the parcels would be categorised as being of ‘moderate’ importance to the purpose. However, other urban areas may be subject to a significant reduction in physical and visual separation, or potential merger as a result of such development.

2.38 Where parcels do not lie directly between two towns it would be adjudged as being of 'Slight/Negligible' importance, as strategic development could be accommodated without being in conflict with this purpose. As above, other urban areas could potentially be affected in the same way as the above two categories. Criteria for the assessment of Purpose 2 are set out in the following table:

DRAFT

**Table 3 Criteria for Green Belt Purpose 2: Prevent Neighbouring Towns from merging into one another**

- 1) Does the parcel lie directly between two towns and form all or part of a gap between them?
- 2) What distance is the gap between the towns?
- 3) Are there intervening settlements or other development on roads that would be affected by release from Green Belt?
- 4) Would development in the parcel appear to result in the merging of towns or compromise the separation of towns physically?
- 5) Would the development of the parcel be a significant step leading towards coalescence of two settlements?

<p><b>Critical importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of paramount importance</p>	Critical	<p>Land is <b>fundamental</b> to physical separation of neighbouring urban areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any reduction in extent would result in physical coalescence, or a perception of merging that would erode the distinct separate identity and character of either/both settlements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Major importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of major importance</p>	Major	<p>Land provides an <b>important</b> contribution to separation between neighbouring urban areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no significant inter-visibility between the urban areas currently.</li> <li>• Some limited development may be possible without causing merger or perception of merging, although the area is unlikely to be able to accommodate a strategic level of development (although intervening smaller settlements may be affected substantially by reduction of separation, merger, or inter-visibility).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Moderate importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of moderate importance</p>	Moderate	<p>Land provides only <b>moderate</b> contribution to separation between neighbouring urban areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land is part of a substantial gap between neighbouring urban areas with separate identities.</li> <li>• Land where well planned strategic levels of development would not result in merger or a perception of merging as a consequence of inter-visibility (although intervening neighbourhoods may be affected significantly by reduction of separation, merger or inter-visibility).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Slight/Negligible importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of minor/negligible importance</p>	Slight/ Negligible	<p>Land does not lie between two towns and makes a <b>very limited</b> contribution to separation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic level of development would have no impact on this Green Belt purpose, although other urban areas may be affected by reduction in separation, merger, or inter-visibility depending on their proximity to the urban edge.</li> </ul>

***Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment***

- 2.39 Any Green Belt land around the periphery of the urban area may be said to fulfil this purpose. It is the overall restrictive nature of Green Belt policy that protects the surrounding countryside by preventing development and directing it towards existing settlements.
- 2.40 Whilst the quality of the landscape is not a reason for designating land as Green Belt, the search for the most appropriate locations for any significant development should be informed by landscape character assessment. By applying this approach in connection with this purpose it follows that, all other things being equal, parcels that have a stronger rural character should be afforded particular protection via this purpose, in contrast with those parcels that possess a semi-urban character and where encroachment has already occurred.
- 2.41 Such areas may offer the potential for repair and/or enhancement through a well-considered approach to development. Any urban extension may be considered as an 'encroachment' into the Green Belt. This is where consideration of landscape character and the potential ability of the landscape to accommodate change fulfil an important role. The criteria for assessing Purpose 3 and the criteria for the consideration of landscape character and sensitivity to change are set out in the following tables.

**Table 4 Criteria for Green Belt Purpose 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment**

Are there clear strong and robust boundaries to contain development and prevent encroachment in the long term?

- 1) Does the parcel have the character of open countryside? - What is the nature of the land use in the parcel? Is any of the land previously developed?
- 2) Is the parcel partially enclosed by a town or village built up area?
- 3) Has the parcel been affected by a substantial increase in the mass and scale of adjacent urbanising built form?
- 4) Is there any evidence of significant containment by urbanising built form?
- 5) Has there been incremental erosion of the open character of the land on the edge of the settlement (so that it appears as part of the settlement)?
- 6) Does there appear to be a high degree of severance from the adjacent Green Belt?

<p><b>Critical importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of paramount importance</p>	<p>Critical</p>	<p>Retention of the countryside is <b>fundamental</b> to the purpose of retaining land within Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land possesses a strong rural character which Green Belt designation protects.</li> <li>There may be no other fundamental constraints to encroachment (such as a strong landscape feature that could assist in fulfilling this purpose by containing development from outlying countryside).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Major importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of major importance</p>	<p>Major</p>	<p>Retention of the countryside is of <b>major</b> importance to the purpose of retaining land within the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land possesses a predominantly rural character.</li> <li>There may be other minor constraints (such as a landscape feature) that would limit encroachment but where the Green Belt provides important protection.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Moderate importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of moderate importance</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Retention of the countryside is <b>moderately</b> important to the purpose of retaining land within the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land possesses a semi-rural character and there is already a perception of significant encroachment.</li> <li>There may be other constraints to further encroachment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Slight/Negligible importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of minor/negligible importance</p>	<p>Slight/ Negligible</p>	<p>Retention of the land is of <b>very limited/no</b> importance to the purpose of retaining land within the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land possesses a semi-urban character and is no longer perceived to be part of the countryside.</li> <li>It may contain degraded land that provides opportunities for enhancement.</li> </ul>



**Table 5 Landscape Character and Sensitivity to Change Criteria to inform Purpose 3**

<p><b>Little/No Capacity for Change</b> Landscape highly sensitive to change.</p>	<p>Little / None</p>	<p>Land has predominantly <b><u>strong rural character</u></b> that is highly sensitive to change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land consists of an uncontained exposed open area where the impact of development would extend over a wide area, or where there may be little/no potential to mitigate the adverse effects of changes.</li> <li>• Strategic level of development likely to have substantial adverse impacts on landscape character and/or substantial adverse impacts on landscape features that are considered to be important to the setting of the town.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Low Capacity for Change</b> Landscape sensitive to change.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Land has <b><u>predominantly intact rural character</u></b> and is sensitive to change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land may be a poorly contained area (such as elevated land) where changes could extend over a wide area and there may be limited potential to mitigate the adverse impacts of the changes.</li> <li>• Strategic level of development likely to have significant adverse impacts on landscape character and/or significant adverse impacts on landscape features that are considered to be important to the setting of the town.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Moderate Capacity for Change</b> Landscape capable of accepting some change without undue harm.</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Land of either <b><u>unexceptional character</u></b> with significant detracting elements, or area with <b><u>stronger character</u></b> that benefits from significant physical/visual containment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land capable of accommodating significant change without undue harm to wider landscape character and/or landscape features that are considered to be important to the setting of the town.</li> <li>• There may be potential for some enhancements to landscape character in weaker areas.</li> </ul>
<p><b>High Capacity for Change</b> Landscape capable of accommodating substantial change.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Land with <b><u>weakly defined character/degraded land</u></b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land capable of accommodating substantial development without adverse impact on wider character and/or landscape features that are considered to be important to the setting of the town.</li> <li>• There is likely to be substantial potential for landscape enhancement.</li> </ul>

**Purpose 4:** *To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns*

- 2.42 Any land around a town or urban area may be said to contribute to its setting. However, the intention of this purpose is to protect land that makes a particular contribution to those defining historic features of towns and cities (although many towns have historic origins).
- 2.43 The purpose requires a clear view on what historic features contribute to the special character of the town and which have a direct relationship with the surrounding countryside. The study will need to focus on the relationship between key historical features and their landscape setting to ensure robust result that inform the decision making process.
- 2.44 We will draw on information set out in existing evidence base documents, such as the appraisals and management plans for designated Conservation Areas and historic landscape assessments. This information will help set the context of historic areas within the Borough. The criteria for assessing Purpose 4 are set out in the following table.

**Table 6 Criteria for Green Belt Purpose 4. To Preserve the Setting and Special Character of Historic Towns**

Does the parcel make a positive contribution to the setting of the historic town? Measured in terms of: -

- 1) Can features of the historic town be seen from within the parcel?
- 2) Is the parcel in the foreground of views towards the historic town from public places?
- 3) Is there public access within the parcel?
- 4) Does the parcel form part of an historic landscape that is related to an historic town?
- 5) Does the local landform or landscape form part of the setting of a conservation area or village?
- 6) Does the Parcel form part of an historic Landscape?

<p><b>Critical importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of paramount importance</p>	<p>Critical</p>	<p>Land where development would conflict <b>fundamentally</b> with Green Belt purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land clearly forms part of the historic landscape setting of the town or key historic features, and provides a strong contribution to the historic setting.</li> <li>The land may/may not be affected already by the existing physical/visual presence of the urban edge and may have a varied character</li> </ul>
<p><b>Major importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of major importance</p>	<p>Major</p>	<p>Land where development would conflict <b>substantially</b> with Green Belt purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land provides a strong contribution to the setting and historical character of the town.</li> <li>Strategic level of development has potential to undermine this character.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Moderate importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of moderate importance</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Land where development would conflict <b>significantly</b> with Green Belt purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land provides some contribution to the historic setting and special character of the town, although it is significantly reduced by the presence of features/land uses that do not form part of the towns character, or it may be distant from the urban edge and therefore contribute less to the purpose (other land closer to the urban edge performs the function of setting).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Slight/Negligible importance to Green Belt Purpose</b></p> <p>Continued inclusion within Green Belt of minor/negligible importance</p>	<p>Slight/ Negligible</p>	<p>Land where development would have <b>limited</b> impact on this purpose of Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land is physically and visually dominated by the immediate urban edge and has no relationship with key historical feature within the town.</li> <li>Land that is predominately rural away from existing urban areas.</li> </ul>

***Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict land***

- 2.45 It is the overall restrictive nature of Green Belt that, through its limitation of the supply of other development opportunities, encourages regeneration and the re-use of previously developed land within existing urban areas. It is therefore difficult to differentiate how any given parcel of land would contribute to the fulfilment of this purpose. However, it may be possible to draw adequate conclusions about where the release of Green Belt land for development may assist with, or provide a catalyst to the regeneration of adjoining parts of the urban area (by improving access, or providing improved employment opportunities for example).

***Urban Edge Assessment***

- 2.46 In addition to assessing the five purposes it is important to incorporate an urban edge assessment. This will ensure that the existing Green Belt boundaries are fit for purpose; crucially that they can be drawn to defensible boundaries. This process will be used to highlight areas currently outside of the Green Belt that could be added to it and also areas which could be 'rounded off'. This could potentially release land for development.

### 3.0 STRATEGIC OVERVIEW OF THE GREEN BELT IN PENDLE

3.1 The Green Belt in Pendle covers a total of 2,036 hectares, which is approximately 12% of the Borough. In addition to the Green Belt there are two other strategic level designations which protect areas of land and act as a constraint to development, these are:

- Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which covers 2,215 hectares of the Borough
- South Pennine Moors, which has areas designated as; Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), covering a total of 1,542 hectares of the Borough.

3.2 In total, these three strategic level designations cover 5,793 hectares, or 34.2% of the total area of the borough..

3.3 The function and purpose of the designations that cover the Forest of Bowland AONB and the South Pennine Moors are set out in the adopted Core Strategy; specifically within Policy ENV 1 – Protecting and Enhancing Our Natural and Historic Environments (paragraphs 3.83-3.88).

3.4 Whilst the AONB, SPA, SAC and SSSI designations seek to protect specific ecological and landscape assets within the Borough, any protection that the Green Belt does offer to such objectives is consequential and not intended.

3.5 Green Belts are a very broad brush planning policy approach for controlling urban growth. The premise is to protect a ring of countryside around an urban area, where further urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future; preventing urban sprawl and keeping the land permanently open.

- 3.6 The establishment and maintenance of Green Belt around many of the largest urban areas in England has long been part of national planning policy. The concept of Green Belts emerged from Europe in the late 1800s and through the promotion of public societies in London, became a statutory planning function through the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act and the 1946 New Towns Act. By the 1950s Green Belts were beginning to be put into practice. In 1955 through circular 42/55 the principle was extended beyond London.
- 3.7 The Green Belt in Pendle still has an important planning policy function to play in the control of urban growth. However, it is evident that for Pendle to grow sustainably, areas of Green Belt will need to be released for development.
- 3.8 The principle of Green Belt release to ensure that the current housing and economic needs of Pendle can be met over the current plan period were established through the preparation and examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector's report and the adopted Core Strategy are clear that areas of Green Belt will need to be realised.
- 3.9 It is important that following any release of land from the Green Belt for development that the new Green Belt boundary will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period, that the boundary is clearly defined and readily recognisable and that the broad areas of Green Belt around Pendle still contribute to the 5 purposes set out in the NPPF (paragraph 80).
- 3.10 The broad areas of Green Belt in Pendle are between:
- **Padiham/Burnley (north of A671) and Barrowford,**
  - **Colne and Trawden,**
  - **Colne and Foulridge**
  - **Nelson and Barrowford,**
  - **Barrowford and Colne**
  - **Colne and Laneshaw Bridge**
- 3.11 The primary function of each of these broad areas of Green Belt is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and to prevent neighbouring towns and villages from merging into one another.

3.12 Furthermore, the Green Belt around Colne contributes to preserving the setting and special character of the historic market town and the Green Belt around the villages of Trawden, Foulridge, Barrowford and Laneshaw Bridge assist in the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment.

DRAFT

## 4.0 IDENTIFICATION OF GREEN BELT PARCELS

4.1 Using the methodology set out in section 2 of this report, the Green Belt and potential new areas of Green Belt were identified as individual parcels of land for assessment. The parcels have been separated into land currently within the Green Belt, new Green Belt and Protected Areas

4.2 Tables 7, 8 and 9 list all of the land parcels with a description and justification of each parcel. The map(s) in Appendix 2 clearly set out the parcels.

**Table 7 Current Green Belt Parcels**

Parcel Number	Parcel Description
P001	Western boundary follows the edge of Pendle GB, Southern/ Eastern boundary includes Fir Tree Brook and surrounding substantial tree line. Bounded to the north by A6068 (Barrowford Road).
P002	As P001 - boundary includes Fir Tree Brook and surrounding tree line, to the north bounded by A6068 (Barrowford Road), the south eastern boundary follows the River Calder, to the east a strong tree line boundary follows the watercourse.
P003	Enclosed parcel of land by the river Calder and Pendle GB Boundary (consider connection with Burnley GB).
P004	The boundary includes the existing GB boundary, the A6068 (Barrowford Road) to the south, and bordered to the east by Noggarth Road, and to the west by Guide Lane, a road lined with substantial hedgerow and trees.
P004a	The boundary includes the existing GB boundary, the A6068 (Barrowford Road) and the settlement boundary of Higham to the south, and bordered to the east by Guide Lane, a road lined with substantial hedgerow and trees.
P004b	Parcel containing private gardens of the row of properties to the rear at Sabden Road/Slack
P005	Strong tree lined boundaries make up the east and west boundaries following the watercourses. To the north the A6068. To the south by a tree lined lane forms the border (edge of United Utilities ? water services)
P006	Enclosed parcel of land by the river Calder and Pendle GB Boundary (consider connection with Burnley GB)
P007	Boundary follows the river Calder (to the south and west), the M65 to the east, a tree line/ wooded watercourse (as P005), and Green Head Lane to the north east section.
P008	Enclosed parcel of land by the river Calder, Pendle Water and the Pendle GB boundary
P009	Bounded by the M65 and Green Head Lane, which follows into Barden Lane.
P010	Follows the M65, Green Head/ Barden Lane and Pendle Water to the east, the remaining boundary forms the edge of the Pendle GB.
P011	Bounded by Pendle Water to the west and Leeds and Liverpool canal to the



	east, the remaining boundary forms the edge of the Pendle GB.
P012	Bounded by the Leeds and Liverpool Canal to the west and railway line to the east, the remaining boundary forms the edge of the Pendle GB.
P013	The parcel contains sports pitches at the Prairie Playing Fields off Windermere Avenue. The boundary follows the railway line, existing GB boundary and residential edge of Burnley to the east.
P014	Parcel bordered by Green head Lane, the railway track, settlement boundary and B6248 Cuckstool lane.
P015	Follows a substantial tree line (wood)/ change in levels to the west, the B6248 (Cuckstool lane) to the south, and the remaining forming the existing GB boundary.
P016	Follows a substantial tree line (wood)/ change in levels to the east, the A6068 (Barrowford road) to the north, and B6248 (Cuckstool lane) to the west.
P016a	Parcel bound by the A6068 to the south, and residential edge of Fence
P017	Parcel of land north of Fence, west of Harpers Lane; the northern and western boundary is formed by Noggarth Road which has a raised drystone wall and some trees.
P017a	Parcel of land north of Fence, a tree line boundary forms the eastern edge; Harpers Lane forms the western edge, and the remaining border includes the edge of the GB boundary.
P017b	Parcel of land to the north of Fence, west of Noggarth Road. The northern boundary is the existing GB boundary at Croft Top Lane, the western boundary is formed by the river Spurn Clough.
P018	Large parcel following the edge of the GB, open in nature, the southern boundary borders the settlement and Wheatley Lane Road coming out of Fence. The eastern boundary is formed by Sandyhall Lane and a thick tree boundary.
P018a	Parcel to the east of Sandyhall Lane, south and west of the existing GB boundary, and north of Wheatley Lane Road.
P018b	Parcel north of Greenbank Farm at Fence, east of a tree line boundary, south of Noggarth Road and existing GB boundary. The eastern boundary is formed by tree line boundary and un-named stream.
P018c	Parcel north of residential boundary at Wheatley Lane Road, Fence; bound by field boundary and change in topography to the north (sharp hill then immediate flat line within parcel P018c); a line of trees along a stream forms the eastern site boundary.
P019	Bordered to the south by the A6068, to the north by Wheatley Lane Road, to the west by a strong tree boundary and to the north east by a tree lined/ part wooded public right of way.
P019a	Parcel of land to the south of residential edge of Fence at Wheatley Lane Road to the north, A6068 to the south, and a strong tree boundary to the east.
P020	As P019 parcel bordered to the north by Wheatley Lane Road, and to the west by a tree lined/ part wooded public right of way and to the south by the A6068.
P021	Bordered to the north by the A6068, the remaining boundary follows the existing Pendle GB boundary.
P022	Follows the edge of the Pendle GB boundary to the north, the M65 to the

	south, the B6247 (Colne Rd) at the north east and the edge of the sports pitches at the western boundary.
P022a	Parcel containing the Bullholme Playing Fields and cricket ground. Strong tree line boundary to the east; existing GB boundary to the north at Pendle Water; bound by the M65 to the south.
P023	Follows the edge of the GB boundary and the M65. Split from the adjacent boundary by the Leeds and Liverpool Canal.
P024	South of the M65 bordered by the existing GB boundary.
P024b	Parcel of land between existing GB boundary to the south, Greenfield Road to the north, the canal to the west and a stream to the east.
P025	Bordered to the south by the Colne road B6247, the north west boundary follows the existing GB boundary, the eastern boundary follows the Leeds and Liverpool canal.
P026	Bordered by the canal, B6247 to the south, and a substantially tree lined watercourse (Wanless Water) and Red Lane to the east.
P027	North of the M65, enclosed by the Canal and the Colne B6247 road. The existing GB boundary to the east follows a strong line of trees.
P028	As P026 bordered to the west by the substantially tree lined watercourse (Wanless Water), and to the east by the disused railway. Bordered to the north by Red Lane.
P029	Follows the edge of the GB to the west, the disused railway line to the east and split from the adjacent parcel by a tree lined entrance to farm and Red Lane (as P028).
P030	Bordered by Red Lane to the north, the disused railway to the west, and a large wooded area to the east.
P031	Follows Red Lane to the south, the disused railway line to the west, and to the east by Reedy Moor Lane (68),
P032	Inner edge of the GB adjacent to Colne, bordered by Red Lane, including the edge of Alkincoats Park.
P033	Bordered to the north by the Lake Burwain, to the south by Red Lane, to the east by A56 road (Skipton road), and to the west by Reedy Moor Lane.
P034	Largely follows the extent of the lake to the south, up to the edge of the Pendle GB boundary at the north (bound by canal). Split to the east by the A56 (Skipton Road) and at the north east by the B6251.
P034a	Parcel bordered by the B6251 to the south and west, a disused railway line to the north, and the GB boundary at Foulridge to the east.
P034b	Small parcel of land already built on, contained by the B6251 to the north, Walter Hill to the east and the residential boundary and track to the west.
P034c	Parcel of land containing residential properties to the south of Alma Avenue. Bounded by the lake to the south and tree lines to the east and west.
P034d	Parcel containing the Church of Saint Michael and All Angels, together with fields leading down to the lake. Bounded by the lake to the south, the existing GB boundary at the edge of Foulridge to the north, and the A56 to the east.
P034e	Parcel containing two fields to the south of 21 Sycamore Gardens. Bound by the lake to the south, to the north by the residential edge of Foulridge, to the east by a strong tree boundary, and to the west by a field boundary.
P035	This large parcel includes largely open views and follows the outer edge of

	the existing GB boundary to the north, to the south Foulridge Upper Reservoir and tree lined watercourse.
P036	Inner edge of the GB boundary, bordered to the north by the existing watercourse, split to the east by drystone wall field boundary with scattered trees, and to the west by Brownhill Lane.
P036a	Parcel of land containing reservoir, bounded to east by Brownhill Lane, to south by residential edge of Colne, and to the north by a strong tree boundary.
P036b	Parcel containing properties and residential gardens to the north of Noyna View, bound by reservoir to the north and Noyna View to the south.
P036c	Parcel to the north of properties at Manor Road. Bound by the reservoir to the north, Brownhill Lane to the east, and by residential property boundaries at Manor Road and Noyna View.
P037	Following the watercourse to the north west, then bound by Cockhill Lane to the east. Split to the south by Castle Rd. Bound at the west by a field drystone wall boundary with scattered trees and residential boundaries at Castle Road.
P037a	Includes the golf course and runs up to the edge of the GB boundary. Bound by Cockhill Lane to the west and Old Skipton Road to the south
P038	Bordered on the northern boundary by Castle Road, the west forms the existing GB boundary,
P038a	Bound by a drystone wall and tree boundary to the east, west and north, and by Skipton Old Road to the south east.
P039	The northern boundary forms the edge of the golf course and edge of GB boundary; Hill/ Brent Lane forms the southern boundary.
P040	The western edge of this parcel is adjacent to the settlement boundary, the Keighley A6068 forms the southern boundary, Hill/Brent Lane form the northern boundary.
P041	This parcel sits between Colne Water and the Keighley road A6068.
P042	Bordered to the north by Colne Water, to the south east by Keighley Road, to the south by a drystone wall boundary and to the west by Lane Top and Winewall Lane.
P042a	Parcel bound by Trawden Road, Winewall Lane and New Row.
P042b	Bound to the east and south by Lane Top and Keighley Road, to the south by the existing GB boundary and west by the B6250.
P043	Forms the edge of the GB boundary, bordered to the east by the Skipton road B6250.

**Table 8 New Green Belt Parcels**

Parcel Number	Parcel Description
P001a	Parcel of land to the west of Higham, north of the A6068, south of Back Lane to the north, bound to the west by a public right of way and strong tree boundary, and to the east by Acres Brook.
P024a	Parcel of land between existing GB boundary and river (Wanless Water)
P024c	Parcel of land outside the existing GB boundary; bound by Colne Water, the canal and an un-named stream on three sides, with the existing GB boundary to the north.
P035a	New parcel from edge of GB boundary to the eastern edge of Foulridge. South of Noyna Road, west of track with stonewall boundary leading to allotments.
P043a	New parcel, land south of Colne Water, east of Coal Pit Lane, north of track leading to kennels.

**Table 9 Protected Areas**

Parcel Number	Parcel Description
PA.01	Parcel of land to the rear of residential properties at Carr Hall Road, identified as a Protected Area by Core Strategy policy 3A.
PA.02	The parcel lies adjacent to the Sacred Heart RC Primary School, the residential edge of Colne, and the current GB boundary off Red Lane.
PA.03	The parcel lies to the north and south of Old Skipton Road. Castle Road forms the northern boundary, whilst residential properties at Keighley Road form the southern boundary. The parcel lies adjacent to Colne at the west and incorporates the Lidgett Triangle.

## 5.0 ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PARCELS

5.1 The assessment matrix in tables 10 to 12 set out the rating for each site against Green Belt purposes 1 to 4. The comments supporting the assessment for each land parcel and are set out in Appendix 3 of this report.

**Table 10 Site Assessment Matrix Table – Existing Green Belt**

Parcel Number	Purpose 1 - To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas	Purpose 2 - Prevent Neighbouring Towns from merging into one another	Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, Capacity for change	Purpose 4 - To Preserve the setting and special character of Historic Towns
P001	Critical	Major	Major	Low	N/A
P002	Critical	Major	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P003	Critical	Moderate	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P004	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P004a	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P004b	Slight	Slight	Slight	Moderate	N/A
P005	Critical	Major	Major	Little/No	N/A
P006	Critical	Moderate	Major	Low	N/A
P007	Critical	Critical	Major	Low	N/A
P008	Critical	Critical	Major	Low	N/A
P009	Critical	Major	Major	Moderate	N/A
P010	Major	Moderate	Major	Moderate	N/A
P011	Major	Major	Major	Moderate	N/A
P012	Major	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P013	Moderate	Major	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P014	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P015	Major	Critical	Critical (western side); Major (eastern side)	Little/No (western side); Moderate (eastern side)	N/A
P016	Critical	Critical	Major	Low	N/A
P016a	Slight	Slight	Slight	Moderate	N/A

P017	Moderate	Slight	Major	Moderate	N/A
P017a	Major	Slight	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P017b	Major	Slight	Major	Moderate	N/A
P018	Critical	Critical	Major	Low	N/A
P018a	Major	Major	Major	Little/No	N/A
P018b	Major	Slight	Major	Low	N/A
P018c	Moderate	Slight	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P019	Major	Critical	Major	Low	N/A
P019a	Major	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P020	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P021	Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P022	Critical	Critical	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P022a	Critical	Critical	Slight	Moderate	N/A
P023	Critical	Critical	Slight	Moderate	N/A
P024	Major	Critical	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P024b	Major	Major	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P025	Critical	Major	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P026	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P027	Major	Major	Slight	Moderate	N/A
P028	Critical	Critical	Major	Low	N/A
P029	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P030	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P031	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P032	Major	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Slight
P033	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	Slight
P034	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P034a	Moderate	Slight	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P034b	Slight	Slight	Slight	High	N/A
P034c	Slight	Slight	Slight	High	N/A
P034d	Major	Major	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P034e	Major	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P035	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	Moderate
P036	Critical	Moderate	Critical	Little/No	Slight
P036a	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	Slight
P036b	Slight	Slight	Slight	High	Slight
P036c	Moderate	Moderate	Slight	High	Slight
P037	Critical	Slight	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P037a	Critical	Slight	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P038	Critical	Slight	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P038a	Moderate	Slight	Major	Low	N/A
P039	Critical	Slight	Critical	Little/No	N/A



P040	Critical	Major	Critical	Low	Slight
P041	Moderate	Major	Slight	Moderate	Slight
P042	Critical	Major	Critical	Little/No	Slight
P042a	Slight	Slight	Moderate	Low	N/A
P042b	Critical	Critical	Critical	Little/No	N/A
P043	Critical	Major	Critical	Little/No	Slight

**Table 11 Site Assessment Matrix Table – New Green Belt**

Parcel Number	Purpose 1 - To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas	Purpose 2 - Prevent Neighbouring Towns from merging into one another	Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, Capacity for change	Purpose 4 - To Preserve the setting and special character of Historic Towns
P001a	Critical	Moderate	Major	Low - Moderate	N/A
P024a	Moderate	Major	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P024c	Moderate	Major	Moderate	Moderate	N/A
P035a	Major	Slight	Moderate	Low	N/A
P043a	Critical	Moderate	Critical	Little/No	Moderate

**Table 12 Site Assessment Matrix Table – Protected Areas**

Parcel Number	Purpose 1 - To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas	Purpose 2 - Prevent Neighbouring Towns from merging into one another	Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, Capacity for change	Purpose 4 - To Preserve the setting and special character of Historic Towns
PA.01	Slight	Slight	Slight	Moderate	N/A
PA.02	Moderate	Slight	Moderate	Low	Slight
PA.03	Major	Slight	Moderate	Low	N/A

## 6.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 Following the assessment of the identified parcels we consider that some parcels of land may be removed from the Green Belt **if** the Council can prepare further evidence that supports the necessary exceptional circumstances required. There are also areas of land currently outside of the Green Belt that if demonstrated through exceptional circumstances, would make a positive contribution to the purpose of Green Belt in Pendle Borough.
- 6.2 Furthermore, of the 3 Protected Areas assessed through this study, we consider that 2 do not fulfil the function of Green Belt. Whilst protected areas are not 'Green Belt' we consider that it is still necessary for the Council to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances necessary to allocate this land for development.
- 6.3 The Inspector of the Core Strategy considered it necessary for that plan and the emerging Site Allocations document to release land from the Green Belt for development to ensure the Council's proposed spatial strategy could be delivered. Whilst that set a need to undertake an assessment of the Green Belt, it is considered that further evidence is required to release specific parcels of land for development. It is important that the further evidence is used alongside this Green Belt assessment, to identify parcels of land that will contribute in a sustainable way to the Council's spatial strategy and to ensure the broad areas of Green Belt within the Borough still perform their original intended functions.
- 6.4 We consider that the following parcels of land still contribute to the function of the broad areas of Green Belt in Pendle.

**Table 13** Still perform function

Ref	Retain / Remove
P001	Performs Green Belt Function
P002	Performs Green Belt Function
P003	Performs Green Belt Function
P004	Performs Green Belt Function
P004a	Performs Green Belt Function
P005	Performs Green Belt Function
P006	Performs Green Belt Function
P007	Performs Green Belt Function
P008	Performs Green Belt Function



P009	Performs Green Belt Function
P010	Performs Green Belt Function
P011	Performs Green Belt Function
P012	Performs Green Belt Function
P013	Performs Green Belt Function
P014	Performs Green Belt Function
P015	Performs Green Belt Function
P016	Performs Green Belt Function
P017	Performs Green Belt Function
P017a	Performs Green Belt Function
P017b	Performs Green Belt Function
P018	Performs Green Belt Function
P018a	Performs Green Belt Function
P018b	Performs Green Belt Function
P019	Performs Green Belt Function
P019a	Performs Green Belt Function
P020	Performs Green Belt Function
P022	Performs Green Belt Function
P022a	Performs Green Belt Function
P023	Performs Green Belt Function
P024	Performs Green Belt Function
P024b	Performs Green Belt Function
P025	Performs Green Belt Function
P026	Performs Green Belt Function
P027	Performs Green Belt Function
P028	Performs Green Belt Function
P029	Performs Green Belt Function
P030	Performs Green Belt Function
P031	Performs Green Belt Function
P032	Performs Green Belt Function
P033	Performs Green Belt Function
P034	Performs Green Belt Function
P034d	Performs Green Belt Function
P034e	Performs Green Belt Function
P035	Performs Green Belt Function
P036	Performs Green Belt Function
P036a	Performs Green Belt Function
P037	Performs Green Belt Function
P037a	Performs Green Belt Function
P038	Performs Green Belt Function
P038a	Performs Green Belt Function
P039	Performs Green Belt Function
P040	Performs Green Belt Function
P041	Performs Green Belt Function
P042	Performs Green Belt Function
P042b	Performs Green Belt Function
P043	Performs Green Belt Function

Parcel Number	Retain / Remove
PA.03	Performs Green Belt Function

- 6.5 We consider that the following parcels of land no longer contribute sufficiently to the function of the broad areas of Green Belt in Pendle.

**Table 14 No longer performs function**

Parcel Number	Retain / Remove
P004b	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function
P016a	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function
P018c	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function
P021	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function
P034a	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function
P034b	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function
P034c	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function
P036b	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function
P036c	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function
P042a	No longer contribute to overall Green Belt Function

- 6.6 We consider the following parcels of land, currently designated as Protected Areas (Policy 3A) do not fulfil the requirements for inclusion in the Green Belt.

**Table 15 Remove protected areas**

Parcel Number	Retain / Remove
PA.01	Does not contribute to overall Green Belt Function
PA.02	Does not contribute to overall Green Belt Function

- 6.7 The brief for this assessment also required that of parcels of land, adjacent to the existing Green Belt to be considered for designation as Green Belt. Of the 5 parcels of land assessed, we consider the following 4 land parcels would contribute to the broad Green Belt areas in Pendle.

**Table 16 Table of Green Belt to add**

Parcel Number	Add to Green Belt
P001a	Performs Green Belt Function
P024a	Performs Green Belt Function
P024c	Performs Green Belt Function
P043a	Performs Green Belt Function

6.8 It is important to emphasise that these parcels of land it is considered could perform a Green Belt function, should still be supported by exceptional circumstances. If the Council choose to add these land parcels to the existing Green Belt, the land parcels should be added for their function as Green Belt and not as a compensatory measure if other land is removed from the Green Belt. There is no requirement to add to the Green Belt in one area, if some is removed in another.

#### **Exceptional Circumstances**

6.9 Therefore whilst this assessment has consider how each parcel performs against the 5 purposes of Green Belt in the NPPF, it is the whether exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated to release land from the Green Belt for development. If land is assessed to no longer fulfil a Green Belt purpose, the exceptional circumstances to release it from Green Belt are still required. Furthermore, if land identified through this assessment as still contributing to the Pendle Green Belt, does not necessarily imply that exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. Essentially a 'planning balance' must be reached; considering a parcel's contribution to the Green Belt alongside the exceptional circumstances for its release.

## 7.0 GREEN BELT PARCEL RECORDS

Site Reference	
Site Name	
Site Area	
Green Belt Purpose 1	
Comments	
Rating	
Green Belt Purpose 2	
Comments	
Rating	
Green Belt Purpose 3	
Comments	
Rating	
Landscape Character and Sensitivity to Change Criteria to inform Purpose 3	
Comments	
Capacity	
Green Belt Purpose 4	
Comments	
Rating	
Existing beneficial use of the Green Belt	

BEDFORD - BRISTOL - CARDIFF - LEEDS - LONDON - MILTON KEYNES - NOTTINGHAM - RUGBY - SHEFFIELD

**BEDFORD**

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

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

**BRISTOL**

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

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

**CARDIFF**

Sophia House  
28 Cathedral Road  
Cardiff  
CF11 9LJ

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

**LEEDS**

Princes Exchange  
Princes Square  
Leeds  
LS1 4HY

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

**LONDON**

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

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

**MILTON KEYNES**

Midsummer Court  
314 Midsummer Boulevard  
Milton Keynes  
MK9 2UB

Tel: 01908 440 015  
Fax: 01908 357 750  
miltonkeynes@dlpconsultants.co.uk

**NOTTINGHAM**

1 East Circus Street  
Nottingham  
NG1 5AF

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

**SHEFFIELD / SPRU**

Ground Floor  
V1 Velocity Village  
Tenter Street  
Sheffield  
S1 4BY

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

**WILBRAHAM ASSOCIATES**

**RUGBY**

18a Regent Place  
Rugby  
Warwickshire  
CV21 2PN

Tel: 01788 562 233  
info@wilbrahamassociates.co.uk