

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
LDB001		Highways England Mr W Hilton	<p>Thank you for inviting Highways England to comment upon the draft Development Brief for the extension of the Lomeshaye Industrial Estate, located close to Junction 12 of the M65.</p> <p>Whilst this section of the M65 is not currently part of the strategic road network (SRN) that Highways England is responsible for, some traffic generated by this development is likely to end up on the SRN (i.e. M65 west of Junction 10)..</p> <p>We have no specific comment to make on the Brief, other than that we note that the proposed road layout of the extension of the industrial estate does not appear to connect to the existing Lomeshaye Industrial Estate. Whilst this means that traffic generated by the extension would access the M65 at Junction 13, we would advise that careful consideration should be given to any plan to create a connection between the A6068 through the industrial estate to M65 Junction 12. If this were to be an intention, then we would advise that the traffic impacts of increasing traffic at Junction 12 (and the potential benefit at Junction 13) are fully understood.</p> <p>If you would like to discuss anything about this email, please contact me.</p>	<p>The development brief does not propose to require a connection between the upper and lower sections of the strategic employment site. Were a connection to be proposed the traffic implication would be dealt with as part of the planning application for that connection. The Brief recognises that a connection may be possible in future but this is not part of the proposals in the Brief.</p>
LDB002	-	-	Comment withdrawn	-
LDB003		Ms A Charnock	<p>It's great that this estate is being extended which will hopefully bring more jobs to local people, my only concern is access to and from the site as an increase traffic there needs to be at least one additional exit and entrance from the site.</p>	No comment.
LDB004		Ms M Brown	<p>I have looked at the proposals for the new development to Lomeshaye industrial estate. I would like to raise the following concerns.</p> <p>While I am not directly affected by the development living in Earby. It makes me saddens me that again a piece of good agricultural land is being torn up and destroyed by industrial development. We can't go one doing this. There are still so many brown field sites in the Pendle area that should be used first for either home building or industrial developments. We all need the green spaces and the</p>	<p>The need for further employment land and the appropriateness of allocating this site was independently assessed by a Planning Inspector as part of the Examination in Public for the Core Strategy – Part 1 Local Plan. The principle of development has therefore been established.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>food this land provides.</p> <p>The site is away from main bus/train routes, so that will mean more cars on the roads, even though you have included cycle ways these are not always the best option for commuting, the weather in the North West is not always suitable to cycle in.</p> <p>While I agree that industry is important for employment and prosperity there is surely a better way of building the infrastructure that is required.</p>	
LDB005		<p>National Grid</p> <p>Submitted by agents Wood plc Ms HL Bevins</p>	<p>National Grid has appointed Wood to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p>About National Grid</p> <p>National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customers. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus.</p>	No comments

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>Key resources / contacts</p> <p>National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</p> <p>Electricity distribution</p> <p>The electricity distribution operator in Pendle Council is Electricity Northwest. Information regarding the transmission and distribution network can be found at: www.energynetworks.org.uk</p> <p>Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database.</p> <p>CONTACT DETAILS REDACTED</p>	
LDB006		Ms. N Lotz	Sort out the gangs in Bradley View Road, they are now throwing energy drinks and videoing us on their phones. What are we paying Council Tax for????????????One is on the council's website. He is the main leader of this group. You have done nothing for us, no gated scheme, etc.	No comment.
LDB007		Mr R Wilkinson	So we can ride on Bike lanes then get killed on 99% of Pendle roads without cycle paths???Cycle paths are Urgently needed in Pendle and I mean proper ones not just a white line painted on the Pavement or 2 foot wide on the Roads	The Brief sets out the cycling and walking infrastructure that would link the site to other parts of the area and what would be available on site.
LDB008		Pendle Council Mr L Johnson	<p>Overall, I think there is potential to make an attractive looking industrial estate with this. No issues in principle but have some comments to make:</p> <p>2.2 Design Brief – Paragraph 3</p> <p>‘Planting strip along the front boundary...’ this is more of a question than a statement. Is this something that can be condition and/or enforced? The reason I ask this is that if you look at Phase 1, many of the companies do not look after their grounds</p>	<p>The Brief sets out what is expected to happen when the individual units are developed. This includes a planting strip.</p> <p>Untidy sites can be required to be maintained under section 215</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>adequately and it detracts from the amenity value of the site.</p> <p>3.1 General Principles</p> <p>Building on the former agricultural land is going to vastly reduce the capacity of the land to soak up water especially in a flood plain area. Please could I suggest that an additional bullet point is added to the general principle list? Something like; Sustainable drainage systems such as porous car park/footpath surfaces and attenuation tanks are encouraged.</p> <p>Roofs</p> <p>‘Green roofs would be beneficial and would attract ecology to the site.’; Could this be changed to ‘Green roofs are encouraged. These would greatly contribute to the biodiversity of the site and area; and reduce the landscape impact of the site’ or the like?</p> <p>4.2 Design Criteria</p> <p>Bullet point 3 ‘Existing tress and hedgerows are to be retained and protected to British Standards during the construction works.’</p> <p>Landscaping</p> <p>In the introduction to the document you allude to the past landscape elements of the site and I think it would be good to reflect in the landscaping of the units. Therefore I think any hedges that are put in are done so as mainly mixed native species which a laid in the traditional Lancashire style with some standard trees at regular intervals.</p> <p>Species I would be looking at including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) • Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa) • Dog Rose (Rosa canina) • Holly (Ilex aquifolium) <p>Where entrances to sites it would be nice to install reclaimed stone gate posts at either side. These could include elements of ‘dry stone walling’ to related back to the historic use of the site.</p> <p>To the rear of the units (and in particular on boundaries that run along footpaths) the use of a woodland type planting screen should</p>	<p>of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.</p> <p>The Development Brief does not go into the level of detail of designing a drainage arrangement for the site. Paragraph 3.6 refers to Policy ENV7 of the adopted Local Plan which sets out how water management of the site should be designed to achieve.</p> <p>Agreed to change “beneficial;” to “encouraged”.</p> <p>Agreed. The wording will be amended to include reference to British Standards.</p> <p>Agreed. The hedge species referred to at Annex v will refer to Hawthorne, Blackthorn, Dog Rose and Holly.</p> <p>The Site is designed to have a contemporary but sympathetic appearance to its setting. The roadside hedge is to be retained. The entrance would have modern signage and a contemporary feel to it but using materials appropriate to the area. Part 3.4 of the Brief will be amended to include reference to the access being</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>be encouraged.</p> <p>Feature Trees</p> <p>I think with just two types of feature tree listed we are in danger of making a monoculture. Therefore, would it possible to extend the list further to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Alder (Alnus glutinosa) • Birch (Betula utilis) • Hornbeam (Carpinus betulus) • Crab Apple (Malus Evereste) • Ornamental Pear (Pyrus calleryana) • Cypress Oak (Quercus robur Fastigiata) • Whitebeam (Sorbus aria) • Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia) • Sorbus hybrida (Sorbus x thuringiaca Fastigiata) • Lime (Tilia cordata Greenspire) • Lime (Tilia cordata Winter Orange) <p>Trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) • Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa) • Holly (Ilex aquifolium) • Common Alder (Alnus glutinosa) • Silver Birch (Betula pendula) • Hornbeam (Carpinus betulus) • Whitebeam (Sorbus aria) • Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia) • Hazel (Corylus avellana) • Crab Apple (Malus Evereste) • Aspen (Populus tremula) • Bird Cherry (Prunus avium) • Sessile Oak (Quercus petrea) • Common Oak (Quercus robur) • Pussy Willow (Salix caprea) • Mountain Ash (Sorbus aucuparia) • Wild Service Tree (Sorbus tominalis) 	<p>constructed using appropriate materials reflecting the character of the area.</p> <p>Refer back to Lee to streamline the list</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Yew (<i>Taxus baccata</i>) <p>The idea with this is that you have a specimen type tree that would give you some colour and interest then the other trees would give a more naturalistic outcome to the site.</p> <p>Plant Mixes</p> <p>Rather than stipulating a plant mix would it be an idea to say that something like ‘planting schemes should contain a mix of flowering shrubs and perennial plants that are chosen to support bees and other pollinator species’? That way we are more likely to get less uniform and more interesting planting schemes.</p> <p>Bats</p> <p>Obviously, the woodland and hedgerows are going to be hunting grounds for bats. I’m glad that you have addressed lighting with LED lights and low lighting. Could we include something about installing bat boxes?</p> <p>Birds</p> <p>Same goes for bird boxes???</p>	<p>There needs to be some uniformity within the boundaries of having some choice or the estate will not have a cohesive feel to it. The list is appropriate and no changes are proposed.</p> <p>The site is designed to maximise the potential for wildlife to move around and through the site. Bat boxes on industrial buildings are not likely to attract bats to roost in them.</p>
LDB009		Natural England Ms E Knowles	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 09 August 2018</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>We have reviewed the Lomeshaye Development Brief, July 2018 and have the following comments to make.</p> <p>We are pleased to see reference to the retention of existing green infrastructure and safeguarding and creating new habitat corridors within the development brief but we advise that this could be strengthened by including a requirement for biodiversity net gain (as required by NPPF para 174) and the incorporation of new green infrastructure (GI) within the proposed development.</p> <p>Multi-functional GI can perform a range of functions including providing ecosystem services such as climate change adaptation,</p>	<p>Paragraph 174 of the new NPPF deal with how Local Plans should protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity. Paragraph 174 does not require net gains in biodiversity. It states that Plans should identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable gains for biodiversity. The adopted Local Plan sets the overall framework for development in Pendle to improve biodiversity. That Plan includes allocating this site for employment land. It is not a site identified as forming a key part of any ecological network. NE acknowledge that the Brief provides for corridors</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>health and wellbeing, flood management, air quality, alternative transport links and habitat creation (specifically those habitat types impacted by the development). GI can be used to connect isolated areas of green space and habitat. The GI network should itself be connected to the wider landscape and should be used to provide a biodiversity net gain for the development.</p> <p>Additional advice can be found in Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Guidance. GI evidence and case studies, including the economic benefits of GI can be found on the Natural England Green Infrastructure web pages and on Natural England’s Access to Evidence - GI web pages.</p>	<p>and within its design. Green roofs will be encouraged, there will be enhanced woodland planting, there will be green corridors and SUDs will be required in line with policy ENV7 of the Local Plan. An appropriate level of GI is provided and no changes to the brief are proposed.</p>
LDB010		Mr S Bromley	<p>I would like to oppose the proposed Lomeshaye development programme.</p> <p>I work on the estate and find that a relaxing walk by the river at lunchtime is incredibly relaxing.</p> <p>Furthermore, the amount of wildlife I see in this area on a daily basis is staggering. Deer, owls, voles, weasels or stoats, kingfishers to name but a few.</p>	<p>The need for further employment land and the appropriateness of allocating this site was independently assessed by a Planning Inspector as part of the Examination in Public for the Core Strategy – Part 1 Local Plan. The principle of development has therefore been established.</p>
LDB011		Mr B Whittle	<p>Since these proposals materially affect a wide section of the public the period of consultation should be extended by a month in which time presentations should be made publicly in Fence, Barrowford and Roughlee at which the plans can be displayed and questions answered. My comments are as follows</p> <p>A building block should be set further back from the 6068 to reduce the visual appearance from the north and the AONB. The existing hedges and trees on the northern boundary should be put in at the start of the development.</p>	<p>The allocation of the site for employment has been through an extensive consultation programme. That has also included an Examination in Public in front of an independent Planning Inspector. The Brief has been advertised by including the draft on the agenda for Policy and Resources, by consulting statutory consultees, by writing directly to adjoining Parishes, by placing copies in public places such as libraries and by advertising in the Local Paper. A six week period was given for comments. The publicity for the Brief has been full and there is no necessity to extend the publicity period.</p> <p>The Brief requires the buildings to be set back from the A6068. It requires the roadside hedge to remain which is itself elevated above the carriageway. The gap between hedge and building will also allow for structural landscaping to be provided. The short term views of the development would therefore be minimised.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>The materials used should be stone and slate which more aptly is in line with the traditional materials in Nelson and Colne described early in the document and is used in many settlement buildings. It needs real quality and not the illustrated buildings which are typical of the tin can structures used on modern industrial estates and look cheap.</p> <p>The plan does not explain how traffic will circulate on this 2nd phase and how and if it can connect to the phase to the south or the original estate. I want a response on this point which is critical. Traffic issues were left an open issue in the Local or core plan. The brief should include a requirement for the developers to implement a system for the control of parking on the allocated spaces, and not on the estate roads as happens at Laithe Farm development. Here there are more cars parked on estate roads than allocated parking areas!</p> <p>I can find no detailed reference as to how the development is to be linked to the road network, which was an issue left open by the Local or Core Plan. The 6068 is a congested fast route with dangerous crossings to Burnley at Greenhead Lane, Brierfield at Cuckstool Lane, the turning into Fence Carr Hall Road, and the roundabout to the Laithe Farm development yet to be developed with a major housing developed with hundreds of cars. These are dangerous crossing points and therefore it is wholly unacceptable to add another major crossing point with many more cars and heavy lorries turning in or out of an Industrial Estate. The provision of traffic lights or a roundabout would impede the proper flow of traffic on a road which was built as a bypass to Fence and residential properties to the North of the site. Problems of congestion are already unacceptable at junction 13 of M65 (despite the recent addition of traffic lights and lane management) and to increase the flow of traffic further from 6068 is wholly</p>	<p>Moving the buildings further into the site will have no impact on how the site is seen from distant higher vantage point to the east.</p> <p>The industrial estate is the strategic employment site for the Borough. It would be used for uses falling within classes B1, B2 and B8 of the town & Country Planning Use Classes Order 1987. It would be unrealistic to build modern portal framed buildings and then clad them in stone and slate. That would also require a design that would be unusable for modern industrial processes.</p> <p>The development brief does not propose to require a connection between the upper and lower sections of the strategic employment site. Were a connection to be proposed the traffic implication would be dealt with as part of the planning application for that connection. The Brief recognises that a connection may be possible in future but this is not part of the proposals in the Brief.</p> <p>The Local Plan specifically considered the infrastructure required to service the employment allocation. Junction 13 was improved in order to provide the capacity to serve the strategic housing and employment allocations in the Local Plan. The A6068 is not congested nor anywhere near at its capacity. The final highway design will be provided as part of a planning application. Discussions with LCC have indicated that there is no need for a roundabout to service the estate.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>unacceptable. This leads to the case for servicing the consultation site from the existing estate roads of the Lomeshaye Estate linked to junction 12 of M65.if the levels permit, or not proceeding with this phase because a satisfactory connection cannot be made. Will you let me see the views of the Highway Authority?</p> <p>Two general points. The issue of the provision of industrial land was accepted at the Local plan inquiry, but I still consider this runs contrary to the policy of containing development to the compact towns and leads to development merging in the valley or corridor of M65. It would have been far better if the Pendle Council had pursued from 19993 an extension of M65 eastwards which would have given more opportunities for investment in the west of the borough in Colne.</p>	<p>The need for further employment land and the appropriateness of allocating this site was independently assessed by a Planning Inspector as part of the Examination in Public for the Core Strategy – Part 1 Local Plan. The principle of development has therefore been established.</p>
LDB012		Ms J Myers	<p>I am writing to object most strongly about this proposed development which appears to have been hidden under the radar until the very last minute.</p> <p>This is agricultural land farmed by the same family for many many years and provides a green buffer between the industrial area of Lomeshaye and the surrounding rural areas</p> <p>It appears the traffic will exit this development onto the A6068,already a notoriously dangerous road.</p> <p>If you drive down the M65 corridor for almost all its length you will find buildings erected, some of them many years ago, which are still awaiting their first tenants!!</p> <p>So why does Pendle council and its favoured status developers need to continue with this practise?</p> <p>There are many other area in Pendle that are in need of development and if Pendle Council felt it really needed to provide this type of development then surely in the interests of probably almost everyone, town and country dwellers together they could put them in a more favourable, less disruptive place.</p> <p>I have been informed the Council has decided to make a CPO on this land without proper consideration towards the landowner.</p>	<p>The allocation of the site for employment has been through an extensive consultation programme. That has also included an Examination in Public in front of an independent Planning Inspector. The Brief has been advertised by including the draft on the agenda for Policy and Resources, by consulting statutory consultees, by writing directly to adjoining Parishes, by placing copies in public places such as libraries and by advertising in the Local Paper. A six week period was given for comments. The publicity for the Brief has been full and there is no necessity to extend the publicity period.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>I find this to be unacceptable, bullying tactics towards a landowner who wants to continue his life’s work in the area he loves.</p> <p>I hope someone will take these comments into consideration, although I have my doubts!! Rather sad state of affairs really.</p>	
LDB013		United Utilities Adam Brennan	<p>Thank you for previously seeking the views of United Utilities as part of the Development Plan process. United Utilities wishes to build a strong partnership with all Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to aid sustainable development and growth within its area of operation. We aim to proactively identify future development needs and share our information. This helps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure a strong connection between development and infrastructure planning; • deliver sound planning strategies; and • inform our future infrastructure investment submissions for determination by our regulator. <p>When preparing the Development Plan and future policies, we can most appropriately manage the impact of development on our infrastructure if development is identified in locations where infrastructure is available with existing capacity. It may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with the delivery of infrastructure in some circumstances.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>United Utilities wishes to highlight that we will seek to work closely with the Council during the Local Plan process to develop a coordinated approach for delivering sustainable growth in sustainable locations. United Utilities will continue to work with the Council to identify any infrastructure issues and appropriate resolutions throughout the development of the Local Plan.</p> <p>We wish to highlight our free pre-application service for applicants to discuss and agree drainage strategies and water supply requirements. We cannot stress highly enough the importance of developers contacting us as early as possible. Enquiries are encouraged by contacting:</p> <p>Developer Services - Wastewater</p>	<p>Agreed. There will be reference to ENV7 and surface water principles in 3.1 of the Brief.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tel: 03456 723 723 • Email: WastewaterDeveloperServices@uuplc.co.uk • Website: http://www.unitedutilities.com/builder-developer-planning.aspx <p>Developer Services – Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tel: 0345 072 6067 • Email: DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk • Website: http://www.unitedutilities.com/newwatersupply.aspx <p>Potential Impact on Public Sewerage System</p> <p>United Utilities feel that the document should be used as a tool to ensure that new development manage surfaces water run-off in a sustainable and appropriate way. Part 3.6 of the document mentions that water management will be covered by policy ENV7 in Pendle’s adopted Core Strategy, which notes the preference for developers to follow the surface water hierarchy. We wish to emphasise the importance of such requirements in ENV7 being repeated or referenced as part of the document, setting out the need to follow the hierarchy of drainage options for surface water in the NPPG which identifies the public sewer as the least preferable option for the discharge of surface water. Further reference to ENV7 as part of the Lomeshaye Development Brief will be useful as development begins to come forward within the allocation, as more preferable options in terms of the surface water hierarchy will be available. This reduces the chances of the development discharging the surface water into the public sewerage network, maintaining the capacity current network within the area and potentially preventing development delay.</p> <p>Whilst United Utilities expects the development of the site to be brought forward in accordance with ENV7, we feel that there’s opportunity to attach surface water management to the principles/requirements within the document. Such linkage could be taken further to mention a requirement for sustainable</p>	

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>drainage as part of the design requirements. As mentioned, such linkage can only strengthen the position of implementing sustainable drainage at development stage.</p> <p>Pendle Council will be aware of the contribution that the design and landscaping of a site can make to reducing surface water discharge. As mentioned above, there are elements of the document that can be elaborated on further to use landscaping as a method to reduce surface water discharge. We recommend that the document include preferences for developers to use permeable surfaces in their layout proposals, use infiltration devices and strategically place swales to reduce the volume and rate of surface water discharge. This is something that policy ENV7 states should be used where possible. We would recommend that you include more linkage to surface water management as part of the development principles, taking advantage of highlighted opportunities within each development area. If there is more inclusion of surface water management within the document, we feel it would put greater emphasis for developers to include such detail within their planning application, to ensure the site is drained in the most sustainable way.</p> <p>United Utilities would expect the approach to sustainable drainage in the outline permission, reference 17/00672/FUL, to be replicated for the entire site. Through making surface water a primary consideration within the development brief, the sustainable delivery of the remainder of the site can be further supported.</p> <p>Large sites and Sites in Multiple Ownership</p> <p>United Utilities wishes to highlight that it has concerns regarding any large sites which are in multiple ownership. The experience of United Utilities is that where sites are in multiple ownership, the achievement of sustainable development can be compromised by developers/applicants working independently. We therefore encourage the respective councils to make early contact with all landowners within the allocation and challenge those landowners on how they intend to work together, preferably as part of a legally</p>	

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>binding framework. We believe that raising this point at this early stage is in the best interest of achieving challenging housing delivery targets from allocated sites in the most sustainable and co-ordinated manner.</p> <p>Applications for developments on sites which are part of wider development plan allocations will be expected to demonstrate how the drainage proposal for the site relates to a wider holistic drainage strategy for the entire site. Any drainage in early phases of development should have regard to future interconnecting development phases.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Moving forward, we respectfully request that the Council continues to consult with United Utilities for all future planning documents. We are keen to continue working in partnership with Pendle Council to ensure that all new growth can be delivered sustainably, and with the necessary infrastructure available, in line with the Council's delivery target.</p> <p>In the meantime, if you have any queries or would like to discuss this representation, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
LDB014		P & L Knowles	<p>We strongly object to the 2nd phase of the extension. The footpaths on Riverside will be compromised by the buildings and road. The river floods – even in Summer. It is far worse in Winter. There have been issues on the last area built on land next to the RIVER. A number of those businesses have had issues with flooding and Received compensation. On the riverside on the end near Quaker Bridge (especially since the weir was removed). The flooding of the fields has been phenomenal a portion of ROAD was washed away. On the Nelson side near phase one a cow drowned and a man drowned. The river has washed away over ¼ acre of land over the last 2 years. This is where the ROAD is being built.</p> <p>There are wild deer and foxes etc. If they are not killed with all the traffic they will move away. There will be very little countryside to be seen as you approach Nelson at Junction 12. Very sad. The EXTRA traffic 1,000 – or more jobs will bring will cause havoc on</p>	<p>The Brief is not for the lower section of the allocation and will not affect directly Pendle Water.</p> <p>The site comprises of actively used farmland of little ecological value.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>the local ROADS.</p> <p>A proposed Roundabout onto the A6068 from Nelson to Padiham will bring more chaos and accidents as most of the A6068 is Single Lane with many side roads to Carr Road and Fence 3 access + Brierfield Higham etc. etc.</p> <p>Junction 12 is already a bottleneck Even with the traffic lights – 1,000 people will cause chaos.</p> <p>Maybe the Council should make sure all the units are full on phase one that was built many years ago before putting up more buildings and destroying our beautiful countryside.</p> <p>The Lancashire Telegraph (20th Sept) reads like everything is passed and a-go-development yet we understood objections in writing were being looked into up to the 25th September 2018.</p> <p>We are very sad local residents who love our local countryside and wildlife. Sadly I understand that it is compulsory purchase and the local farmer who wants to stay in His Home – has been told he has <u>NO</u> choice. He has to move. "It is a compulsory purchase." So really this letter is not of any value <u>BUT</u> we do object strongly!</p>	<p>The final design of the junction will be brought forward as part of any planning application. Any works to the highway will have to pass a safety audit.</p> <p>The development of the upper phase will not access through Junction 12.</p> <p>There is a high occupancy rate on the current Lomeshaye Industrial estate of 96%. The need for the development has been established as part of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Brief has been out to consultation and the responses to that have to be considered by the Council.</p> <p>This issue is not part of the consideration of this Development Brief.</p>
LDB015		Historic England Mr S Boyle	<p>Historic England is the Government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England. We are a non-departmental public body established under the National Heritage Act 1983 and sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). We champion and protect England's historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly understood, enjoyed and cared for.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above document. At this stage we have no comments to make on its content.</p> <p>If you have any queries or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	No comment
LDB016		Roughlee Parish Council	<p>1 INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1.1The site of the proposed extension to the industrial estate lies some 600m to the south of the Roughlee Parish boundary. There</p>	The development brief indicated at 4.3 that Parish Councils near to the site will be consulted. Roughlee Parish is separated from

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
		Ms M Reed	<p>are, therefore, potential visual and environmental impacts on the Parish. The site also abuts the A6068, Barrowford Road, which is the main distributor road linking Roughlee to adjacent main settlements. As such the Parish Council believe that they have a direct interest in the development of the site and note, with regret, that they were not formally consulted as indicated in paragraph 4.3 of Part 1 of the Brief. They wish that the following comments be taken into account before the Brief is adopted.</p> <p>2 COMMENTS ON PART 1. STATUS OF THE BRIEF – PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>2.1 As the Brief points out the policy context is established by Policy WRK 3 of the adopted Core Strategy. This policy is, however, qualified by five criteria, three of which are of particular relevance to the development of the site but which are not adequately dealt with by the Development Brief. These criteria are a) The site is adequately connected by a new road to the primary road and motorway network and is accessible by public transport, walking and cycling; d) A detailed development brief (including a design code) is prepared to demonstrate that the site will be developed in an appropriate manner; and e) The development addresses any potential environmental impacts (Policy ENV1).</p> <p>2.2 With regard to access arrangements the Brief does not show with any precision how the site will be accessed. There are a number of diagrammatic representations suggesting that the site might be accessed through the site from the Phase 1 development or from one, two or three access points to the A6068. None of these diagrammatic representations are presented in any detail even though the detail of layout and landscaping is dependent on this point being clear. As such the Brief does not comply with Policy WRK3.</p>	<p>the site by the A6068, fields, Wheatley Lane Road and further fields. The Parish is not near to the development and was not directly consulted as with other Parishes not near. There was however wide publicity and the Parish have made full comments on the draft.</p> <p>The purpose of the Brief is not to provide full plans of the development nor to provide a final design. WRK3 d states that a development brief will be developed to ensure that the site will be developed in an appropriate manner. From Stage 2 of the Design Narrative it is clear that a single vehicular access will be provided and the remainder of the design principles are developed using the principle of a single access. The Brief is very clear that a single access will be provided.</p> <p>Criteria a of WRK3 requires that the site is adequately connected to the primary road and motorway network. The site would directly access the A6068 which in turn is a short distance from the M65. That is a clear and direct link to the primary road network. Junction 13 has been upgraded in anticipation of the strategic growth allocated in the Local Plan.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>2.3 Following from the points made in paragraph 2.2 above, it is noted that there is no Traffic Impact Assessment accompanying the Brief and no apparent input from the Highway Authority or other highway expert. It is abundantly clear to the Parish Council, and to many others, that the creation of a new access to the A6068 which caters for slow moving heavy vehicles, possibly in large volumes, will lead to serious highway safety problems on an already dangerous road. Without a proper highway study the Brief has little validity.</p> <p>2.4 Point d) of the Policy requires that the site will be developed in an appropriate manner. Without addressing the fundamental issue of access it is not possible to know if the site can be developed in an appropriate manner. As such the Brief also fails to comply with Policy WRK3 in this regard.</p> <p>2.5 Point e) requires that the development addresses any potential environmental impacts and references Policy ENV1. The Parish</p>	<p>The ability of the site to be serviced by a safe road network was assessed during the site allocation process in the Local Plan. It is not the role of the Development Brief to consider matters of principle which in effect are opening up the debate of whether the site is or is not suitable per se for it to be allocated for development. Paragraph 95 of the Inspector’s decision letter into the Local Plan states <i>“The site can be accessed from Junction 13 along the A6068.”</i> That conclusion was reached after evidence from highway consultants and LCC. The Brief is not the method to examine the principle of accessing the site via the A6068 as that has been established as part of its allocation. The Brief is there to set the design criteria for the site’s development.</p> <p>The site assessment evidence submitted to the Local Plan examination states that access to the site would be possible from the A6068 and the existing industrial estate. It included an assessment of the potential by traffic consultants.</p> <p>LCC have been consulted on the Brief and do not object to there being a new access onto the A6068. The final design of that would be clarified as part of any planning application which is the appropriate time to consider the final details of the access design. The Brief adequately deals with the principle of having a single access onto the A6068.</p> <p>The comments do not take into account the process of allocating the site. The Brief role is not establish the principle of development nor the principle of having an access onto the A6068. That has already been established through the Local Plan adoption process. An independent inspector has concluded that an access onto the A6068 is both possible and acceptable. The Development Brief is the next step in looking at appropriate design solutions to implement that allocation.</p> <p>Point e of policy WRK3 does not require the Brief to address any potential environmental impacts. It requires the development</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>Council would also draw attention to Policies ENV2 and ENV3 which are of particular relevance to the type of development proposed. It is also noted that a planning application for the proposal would fall within Schedule 2 10(a), Industrial Estate Projects exceeding 0.5ha, of the Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Brief clearly fails to address environmental issues except in a very narrow local sense and, again as such, does not comply with relevant planning policy.</p> <p>2.6 In light of the above points the status of the Development Brief is highly questionable and its value in guiding development of the site is very limited. In view of these deficiencies the Development Brief cannot have any standing as part of the Local Plan.</p> <p>3 COMMENTS ON THE DESIGN CODE</p> <p>3.1 In addition to the above points the Parish Council have a number of comments on the detailed Design Code. Many of these comments reflect the deficiencies identified above.</p>	<p>overall to address those. If the policy had intended that the Brief would be the vehicle to address all environmental issues then that would have been specifically referred to in WRK 3 d.</p> <p>The Brief is not there to fulfil the role of a full planning application. Nor, as is suggested in the comments, is there a need for it to fulfil the role of an Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>The comments do not indicate how in the opinion of the Parish the Brief is deficient. It must be noted that the principle of this site, including its ecological value and potential environmental impacts, has been considered in allocating it. The Brief is part of a process to ensure that the site is developed in an appropriate way but the Brief is not to be considered in isolation. It will inform the considerations of any future planning application.</p> <p>The Brief considers, amongst other issues, landscape impact, wildlife corridors, design and water management. The comments made by the Parish do not inform us of why they consider these elements are not dealt with properly.</p> <p>There is no indication in the comments as to why the Brief is not fit for purpose and does not deal with the issues that it is intended to do which is to look at whether the site “<i>will be developed in an appropriate manner.</i>” The Brief is appropriate to deal with the issues that are relevant to the role of the Brief.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>3.2 Paragraph 3.4 of the Code refers to the northern boundary which adjoins the A6068 which has a well-established hedge and is in a shallow cutting but a new junction will breach this enclosure. The Parish Council note that, if a new major junction is constructed here, it will involve destruction of the hedge, construction of slip roads and expose the site visually. This would be particularly damaging if 8m high buildings are constructed, as proposed.</p> <p>3.3 In Annex i, Planning Considerations, is the following Statement: “There is a need for a balanced approach in determining the optimum developable area in consideration of the sites physical attributes and contextual identity.” If this means what we think it means, the Parish Council agree. It is important that the site is not “over developed” and that existing natural features and view - points are protected where-ever possible. Paragraph 4 of this section also refers to screening from Nelson. Equally important is screening from the north.</p> <p>Also in Annex i is a map which describes the A6068 as a dual carriageway. This is such fundamental error as to raise questions about the accuracy of the document generally.</p> <p>3.4 Annex ii looks at the development of the Master Plan. There is very little explanation of how one stage moves to another but it is noted that in steps 3 to 5 access through to The Phase 1 industrial estate is shown. This is something the Parish Council support rather than a new access onto the A6068 which should be avoided. However, in Annex iii, the Illustrative Master Plan, this option of a link to Phase 1 disappears. The Parish Council also question the area bordering the A6068. There is minimal screening along this boundary and the building layout is a regimented row of 8m high buildings. This is an unimaginative and intrusive form of development. A lower density more diverse and less regimented layout would assist integration of the estate into the countryside and we would draw your attention to the “contextual identity” referred to in Annex i.</p>	<p>In allocating the site the Inspector accepted that an access would be onto the A6068. Clearly creating an access would open the site up to accommodate that. The Brief proposes that there would be landscaping at the entrance to help offset this impact.</p> <p>The siting of an industrial estate will have a visual impact. The broad principle of that impact has been agreed as part of the Local Plan as being acceptable. The Brief proposes a range of landscape and design features that will allow the site to be brought forward utilising the land efficiently but respecting the environmental impacts developing it would have.</p> <p>Reference in the Key to Dual carriageway will be altered to A Road.</p> <p>Step 3 does not show a link to Phase 1. Step 4 indicates that the two phases could be linked by a bridleway as does Step 5. There is a potential to link the two phases up in future. However the Brief does not propose that nor doe Pendle propose a link..</p> <p>The development proposes to retain the roadside hedge which is elevated above the carriageway. There would be a setback of the buildings and planting in between. That would give a good degree of screening and prevent the site form being obtrusive fort the by-pass. The Brief does not propose to hide the development but integrate it in an appropriate way which the proposed layout does.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>4 CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>4.1 The Parish Council of Roughlee have significant reservations relating to the Lomeshaye Development Brief. It does not deal in any detail with the access arrangements which are probably the main area of concern for local residents. Its Environmental Impact Assessment is non-existent and the way it arrives at the Illustrative Master Plan is superficial. The document does not form a credible basis to consider future planning applications and it should not be attributed any status in this regard.</p>	<p>No further comment. These issues are commented on above.</p>
LDB017		Mr D Sutherland	<p>I wish to express concerns about the proposed expansion of Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.</p> <p>If there is to be road access to the Fence Bypass, I have concerns about the impact on the local community. More traffic will increase air pollution on what is already a busy road. There have been a number of fatalities on this road over the years and although there have been improvements and speed restrictions, I feel it will increase the risk of further accidents. I appreciate that Junction 13 has had traffic lights installed which do help with the flow of traffic at most times of the day, but at busy times there are still queues to leave the motorway. The fact that traffic for Barrowford has to go from two lanes to one just before Nelson and Colne College causes delays.</p> <p>I appreciated the need for jobs in the area and the need to plan ahead, but once again "virgin" land is being taken for development .There are many empty sites in the Pendle area, such as the one previously occupied by Coloroll, which have been vacant for years. The Lomeshaye Industrial Estate is easy to get to by road but it is a long walk from residential areas. I know of a young person leaving college who has got an apprenticeship on the Estate. They have walked there but with winter approaching, have bought a car to make getting to work easier and drier.</p> <p>I hope you will consider these points when making a decision.</p>	<p>The ability of the site to be serviced by a safe road network was assessed during the site allocation process in the Local Plan. It is not the role of the Development Brief to consider matters of principle which in effect are opening up the debate of whether the site is or is not suitable per se for it to be allocated for development. Paragraph 95 of the Inspector's decision letter into the Local Plan states "<i>The site can be accessed from Junction 13 along the A6068.</i>" That conclusion was reached after evidence from highway consultants and LCC. The Brief is not there to examine the principle of accessing the site via the A6068 as that has been established. The Brief is there to set the design criteria for the sites development.</p> <p>The site has been allocated in the Local Plan which was the subject of an independent examination in public. The principle of developing the site has been accepted via the Local Plan adoption process and its allocation.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
LDB018		Lancashire County Council Mr M Hudson	<p>Thank you for consulting Lancashire County Council on the Lomeshaye Development Brief. LCC has reviewed the information provided and has the following observations to make.</p> <p>a) Site specific flood risk assessment</p> <p>An important part of the planning application process is consideration of flood risk as detailed under Footnote 50 of Paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This is facilitated through a site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA) which will be required for this development proposal because the application site is larger than 1 hectare in size. The LLFA would expect for the site specific FRA to consider the risk of flooding from all sources, including surface water, ground water and ordinary watercourses.</p> <p>b) Development layout</p> <p>The layout of the development should be designed in accordance with the findings and recommendations of the site-specific FRA. Doing so will ensure that the level of flood risk to and from the development site is properly understood, and it will also help to identify any flood mitigation or flood resilience measures that may be required to deal with those risks. The expectation would be for the most vulnerable parts of the development to be located in the areas at lowest risk of flooding from any source, and for exceedance routes to be directed away from property and infrastructure. Existing watercourses and overland flow routes should be retained where possible. Building over or within close proximity to an existing watercourse (open or culverted) would not be advised as it can restrict access for future maintenance and it can also interfere with overland flow routes should the watercourse become blocked or its capacity become exceeded.</p> <p>c) Surface water drainage</p> <p>The proposed scale of development could present risks of flooding on or off-site if surface water is not effectively managed for the lifetime of the development. An appropriate surface water drainage strategy will therefore need to accompany any subsequent planning application submitted to the local planning</p>	<p>A planning application would have to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. The site is not in a flood risk area but effluent disposal would need to be dealt with. This is recognised in the Brief.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>authority. This must comply with Paragraph 80 of the Planning Practice Guidance, Paragraph 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Standards 2, 4, 7, 8 and 9 of the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems; March 2015. Suitable allowances should be made for climate change and urban creep, and surface water should be managed as close to the surface as possible; prioritising infiltration as a means of surface water disposal where possible. If the development is to be constructed in phases, then a masterplan drainage strategy should be developed to show how surface water will be managed through each phase of development.</p> <p>d) Sustainable drainage systems</p> <p>Sustainable drainage systems offer significant advantages over conventional piped drainage systems in reducing flood risk. Sustainable drainage systems can attenuate the rate and quantity of surface water run-off from a site, and they can also absorb diffuse pollutants and promote groundwater recharge. Ponds, reed beds and seasonally flooded grasslands are also particularly attractive features within public open space. The wide variety of available sustainable drainage techniques means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles and provide multiple benefits, reducing costs and maintenance needs.</p> <p>e) Land drainage consent</p> <p>The LLFA are the consenting body for works on Ordinary Watercourses. Under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 (the "LDA") (as amended by paragraph 32 of Schedule 2 of the FWMA 2010) anyone who intends to carry out works which may obstruct or affect the flow of an ordinary watercourse needs written consent from Lancashire County Council. It is important to note that Land Drainage Consent is a separate application process that lies outside the planning legislation. It should not be assumed therefore the grant of planning permission means that Land Drainage Consent will automatically be given. Parallel processing of Land Drainage Consent applications is advised, as any land</p>	

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>drainage consenting issues could directly impact the suitability of the development layout. Land Drainage Consent applications can take up to eight weeks to process following receipt of all required information and payment (£50 per structure). Retrospective consent cannot be issued.</p> <p>f) Highway drainage matters</p> <p>For avoidance of doubt, this response does not cover highway drainage or matters pertaining to highway adoption (s38 Highways Act 1980) or off-site highway works (s278 Highways Act 1980). This is for the local highway authority to comment on.</p> <p>In addition to the above comments Lancashire County Council would be grateful if you could recognise the primacy of delivering new growth opportunities in this part of East Lancashire, in regards to local economic growth in Support of East Lancashire's economy.</p> <p>I trust the above is of benefit to the progress of the Lomeshaye development brief consultation. I look forward to continuing our close work as the local plan progresses.</p>	
LDB019		J Heaps	<p>After taking an interest into how Pendle Council has conducted its self when dealing with this proposal I have reached a decision not to bother commenting fully.</p> <p>It is, in my opinion absolutely disgusting in the under hand way it has treated firstly the owner of the land, by virtually robbing it off him and secondly the people of Pendle, particularly those living in the villages nearby who will have greater difficulty in joining the A6068 road (which is NOT A DUAL CARRAGE WAY as it has been reported to be),when the 600 housing development in Barrowford goes ahead.</p> <p>This I believe is the second ' public' consultation, as the first was conveniently not made public in my opinion.</p>	<p>No comment</p> <p>This Brief has been prepared to fulfil the policy requirement of the adopted Part 1 Local Plan.</p> <p>The Brief has been considered by Committee to assess if it is appropriate for it to go out to consultation. The Brief has been advertised in the press, local facilities such as libraries, individual Borough Councillors, on the Councils website, to parish Councils and to utility providers. It has been fully and publicly consulted on in a comprehensive way.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			As I stated the is no point commenting fully as this council takes little or no notice of it's public.	No comment.
LDB020		Barrowford Parish Council Mr I Lord	<p><u>Introduction</u></p> <p>1 (i) The Parish Council appreciates being consulted on the Development Brief for the Phase 2 extension to the Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.</p> <p>1 (ii) Representatives from the Council in fact raised issues of access to the Site as far back as the Examination in Public by the Inspector of Pendle's Core Strategy in 2015. Clearly Barrowford has an interest in this and environmental aspects of the Phase 2 extension, as Carr Hall Ward of the Parish is almost adjacent to the site, and traffic along the A6068 comes through that ward and continues into the village.</p> <p><u>No Traffic Impact Assessment</u></p> <p>2 (i) The Council find it astonishing that no Traffic Impact Assessment accompanies the brief. Indeed the incorrect description of the A6068 as a dual carriageway raises doubts as to how deeply this key issue has been considered.</p> <p>2 (ii) The A6068 has already had more than its fair share of accidents. Highway police are frequently there (very often at the edge of Carr Hall) with cameras monitoring the excessive speeds of vehicles along it</p> <p>2 (iii) Planning permission for a site of 500 houses has been granted at the Trough Laithe site, with its main vehicle entrance at the roundabout for the Riverside Business Park (which also has permission to expand) on the A6068 just down from the proposed Lomeshaye extension.</p> <p>2 (iv) A hotel and crèche have also been granted permission at Riverside Business Park, again with access from that roundabout.</p> <p>2 (v) Together these amount to a very considerable forthcoming increase in traffic in both directions already along the A6068.</p> <p>2 (vi) The extension is described as possibly providing up to 1000 jobs. This represents a potentially massive increase in traffic along</p>	<p>The ability of the site to be serviced by a safe road network was assessed during the site allocation process in the Local Plan. It is not the role of the Development Brief to consider matters of principle which in effect are opening up the debate of whether the site is or is not suitable per se for it to be allocated for development. Paragraph 95 of the Inspector's decision letter into the Local Plan states "<i>The site can be accesses from Junction 13 along the A6068.</i>" That conclusion was reached after evidence from highway consultants and LCC. The Brief is not there to examine the principle of accessing the site via the A6068 as that has been established. The Brief is there to set the design criteria for the sites development.</p> <p>LCC have been consulted on the Brief and do not object to there being a new access onto the A6068. The final design of that would be clarified as part of any planning application which is the appropriate time to consider the final details of the access design. The Brief adequately deals with the principle of having a single access onto the A6068.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>the A6068, much of it slow moving and heavy.</p> <p>2 (vii) The Parish Council is therefore justifiably concerned at the lack of serious consideration given to the consequences of access to the Lomeshaye extension in the brief.</p> <p>Access</p> <p>3 (i) The Broad Conceptual Options in the Design Narrative Annex ii of the Design Code (it would have been helpful if there had been page numbers) refer to up to three entrances to the extension from the A6068' with no linkage to the existing site other than pedestrian and cycling ones.</p> <p>3 (ii) If any of these were to be created the A6068 would, in the Parish Council's view' become unacceptably dangerous</p> <p>3 (iii) The effect on junction 13 of the M65 just outside the Parish would be very heavy. Even with its new roundabout system it is regularly congested.</p> <p>3 (iv) There is only one clear mention, at Step 4 of Stage 2 Preliminary Masterplan of a "realignment of road to illustrate how it could potentially link to Phase 1 Lomeshaye Industrial Estate extension", but even here an access from the A6068 is envisaged.</p> <p>3 (v) The Parish Council strongly believes that all heavy traffic should come from the Phase 1 extension of the Industrial Estate. The topography is difficult but should not be unmanageable.</p> <p>3 (vi) In its discussions the Parish Council felt that consideration could be given to a narrow gate access from the A6068 restricted to emergency and small vehicles only, as at Junction Street, Nelson.</p> <p>Environment</p> <p>4 (i) A string of junctions along the A6068 would drastically expose the whole site from the road and from points north. At the moment the site is well screened.</p> <p>4 (ii) The Illustrative Masterplan shows some seven plots very close to the edge of the A6068, which, it is proposed later in the brief, can be up to 8 metres high. These would dramatically change the rural nature of the road. In this regard the Parish Council feels that the Masterplan comprises an overdevelopment of the site.</p>	<p>As detailed in 2.3 the level of detail is appropriate for the access.</p> <p>The Brief goes through a series of stages in reaching a set of design principles. The Brief proposes one access into the site.</p> <p>The development proposes to retain the roadside hedge which is elevated above the carriageway. There would be a setback of the buildings and planting in between. That would give a good degree of screening and prevent the site form being obtrusive fort the by-pass. The Brief does not propose to hide the development but integrate it in an appropriate way which the proposed layout does.</p>

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>Conclusions</p> <p>5 (i) Barrowford Parish Council views heavy vehicle traffic access from the A6068 with extreme concern and supports the design proposing linkage to the phase 1 extension for such traffic.</p> <p>5 (ii) The council has serious concerns regarding the loss of a rural visual landscape as a result of the location of the proposed top row of plots on the site closest to the A6068.</p>	
LDB021		P Ashworth	<p>I strongly object to any further development of Lomeshaye. It is eating again into the green of the area. There are industrial buildings and areas sitting empty which should be used / developed first. Unfortunately I know all objections will be ignored and Pendle Council and Barnfields will do whatever they want as usual.</p>	
LDB022		Old Laund Booth Parish Council Ms R Hay	<p>The parish council wishes to re-iterate its concern over the phase 2 extension of the Lomeshaye Industrial Estate and particularly objects to the compulsory purchase order which has been made on a landowner from the parish.</p> <p>The council is also very concerned:</p> <p>(1) There has been no traffic impact assessment made and councillors feel this is very unsatisfactory considering access will be made from the A6068 bypass.</p> <p>The bypass attracts high speeding vehicles, there have been many accidents and police road safety officers often monitor the area with speed guns.</p>	

Representations submitted in response to public consultation: 10 August to 21 September 2018

Comment ID	Representor ID	Organisation / Representor	Comments (verbatim)	Council Response
			<p>The extension expects to create around 1,000 jobs and will therefore bring more traffic to the bypass and potentially increase road safety fears and subsequently road accidents. This added to the extra traffic generated now permission having been given for 500 houses at Trough Laithe and a hotel and crèche. Our concerns are there will more traffic generated on both sides of the bypass, which obviously will have a huge impact on the parish of Old Laund Booth.</p> <p>(2) The brief relates to 3 entrances to the extension from the A6068 with no linkage to the existing site except for pedestrian and cyclist access. We fear this would increase pressure on junction 13 of the M65. The new roundabout system has not resolved congestion problems.</p> <p>(3) We feel that all heavy vehicles should come from the Phase 1 extension and consideration should be made to a narrow gate access from the A6068 restricted to emergency and small vehicles only.</p> <p>(4) We have concerns how the environment will suffer as a string of junctions along the A6068 will expose the whole site from the road and from the north.</p> <p>(5) The masterplan shows seven plots close to the edge of the A6068, which can be up to 8 metres high, and we feel this is over development and will spoil the current rural nature of the road.</p> <p>We hope you will take our concerns on board and re think the project.</p>	