

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
General Comments and Conclusions			
-	-	General comments	<p>Earlier comments on emerging policies and site allocations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many of the comments submitted by Pendle Council, in response to the earlier informal consultation, have not been taken forward in this latest draft of the Colne Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP). As such they have been repeated in this representation, although the Council understands that many of the suggested changes may not have found favour with the CNDP Working Group. Any references to non-conformity with the Local Plan or the NPPF, or non-compliance with the Basic Conditions should be addressed by the Town Council. <p>Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regulation 14 draft of the CNDP, as amended, is that intended to go forward for examination and adoption. It should therefore be suitable for use by planning officers who need policies to be clear and unambiguous so that they can make objective decisions. Each policy box needs to state clearly how the policy is to be applied in practice. The NPPF requires plans and policies to be positively prepared. The wording of several policies refers to what isn't acceptable (development control), rather than the governments preferred approach which is to say what will be supported (development management). The document would benefit from references to the relevant policies in higher order plans (e.g. requirements in CNDP3 should reference Policy ENV1 in Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy). Several policies repeat rather than add detail to the strategic policies set-out in the Pendle Local Plan Part 1, adopted by Pendle Council in December 2015. As such they are not considered to be necessary. Where the CNDP introduces additional requirements that go above and beyond what is required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) these need to be fully justified through the provision of robust and credible evidence, to demonstrate that they will not have an adverse impact on the viability of new development. The document makes extensive use of images of the town, but to what purpose? Images should ideally be used illustrate a specific policy requirement and be properly captioned. Further information on writing effective policies is available in the following documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://mycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Writing-planning-policies-v51.pdf https://mycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/How-to-write-planning-policies.pdf <p>Reasoned Justifications</p> <p>The reasoned justification for many of the policies make little reference to any relevant strategies that are being supported by the policy or the evidence base underpinning it. This is useful to show how the <i>preferred options</i> have been identified and why any alternative options (although reasonable) have not been taken forward. It should also emphasise how the policy helps to preserve local distinctiveness.</p> <p>Monitoring</p>

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
			<p>There is no reference to the monitoring of policies to help ensure that they are being implemented and proving effective. This should be done by identifying suitable indicators for inclusion in the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR), which is published annually by Pendle Council.</p> <p>Other</p> <p>The inclusion of descriptions for many of the images used is to be applauded as this complies with new requirements on accessibility.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Elements of the Regulation 14 draft CNDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> are not capable of being used by planning officers in the determination of planning applications; are not considered to satisfy the Basic Conditions; and add little to existing planning policy, as set-out in the Local Plan, and could be omitted.
The Document			
-	-	Misc.	Please note that typographical and grammatical errors have only been highlighted where they seem likely to impact on the interpretation of planning policy.
Foreword and Contents			
2	2	-	Salterforth does not have a Neighbourhood Plan, nor is it preparing one. Only the plans for Trawden Forest and Barrowford have been formally 'made' by Pendle Council.
4	-	-	It would be useful for the individual policy titles to use the headings function, so that readers can go straight to the policies that they are interested in from the Table of Contents.
1. Introduction and Background			
5	1.1	-	The second sentence may make little sense to the reader, as it is not made clear until the final sentence that NDPs form part of the development plan. The third sentence would benefit if it was clear that "made" in this context means that the plan has been formally adopted.
2. Key Issues and Vision			
7	Table 1	-	<p>Reduced employment prospects post-Pandemic is a threat rather than a weakness.</p> <p>Reopening of the Colne to Skipton rail line and the improvement of services to Skipton, Leeds and Manchester is the opportunity.</p> <p>How is the Foulridge bypass different to the Colne & Villages bypass? The CNDP needs to be consistent in its use of terminology, or make clear to the reader what the differences are.</p>
8	2.2	-	<p>How does Key Issue 1 emerge from the SWOT analysis?</p> <p>How does Key Issue 4 emerge from the SWOT analysis?</p> <p>What is the Sustainability and Transformation Partnership?</p>
9	2.3	-	The Vision is generic rather than locally distinctive.
3. History of Colne			
12-16	-	-	Interesting, but not particularly relevant in a planning document. A more succinct history, linking the past with the key issues that the plan is trying to address today (Chapter 4), would suffice.

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
15	3.14	-	As written, the paragraph does not make it clear that Pendle Council created Ball Grove Country Park .
15	3.15	-	The “ <i>Bronte Moors</i> ” do not exist. This literary reference should be replaced with the term “ <i>South Pennine Moors</i> ” adding “ <i>which inspired the novels written by the Bronte sisters</i> ” or similar wording to that effect.
4. Colne Today			
17-19	-	-	Link to and/or merge with Chapter 3, focussing on the key spatial issues for Colne.
17-19	-	-	Transport is listed as a key priority, yet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no mention is made of traffic congestion issues in the town centre, or along the North Valley no data is presented with regard to the AQMA on Windsor Street no reference is made to the town’s strategic position at the junction of two of the lowest crossings of the Pennine watershed (A56 and A6068) no reference is made to highlight how rail and/or road improvements could address these matters and help to breathe new life into Colne.
19	Figure 5	-	The underlying map so faint that it is difficult for the casual reader to understand how the data relates to the neighbourhood area, which has not been identified on the map.
19	4.12	-	There are three (3) Local Nature Reserves in Colne at Ball Grove; Alkincoats Wood and Greenfield.
5. Planning Policy Context			
20	5.6	-	Typo: “ <i>PLPLCS</i> ” should read “ <i>PLPCS</i> ” Typo: “ <i>will be</i> ” should read “ <i>is</i> ” Typo: “ <i>meet help Demand</i> ” should read “ <i>help meet demand</i> ”
21	5.9	-	Note: The retail hierarchy in the Core Strategy (Policy SDP5) uses different terminology to the settlement hierarchy (Policy SDP2). In this context the reference to “ <i>Key Service Centre</i> ” should read “ <i>Town Centre</i> ”
6. Plan Policies			
24	-	CNDP1	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
24	-	CNDP1	Reference to the Pendle Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, in the opening paragraph, is too narrow. Other relevant policies in the statutory development Plan may be a more flexible way of writing this.
24	A	CNDP1	The policy refers to the Town Centre Redevelopment Zone on the Policies Map Inset Map 5. Although included in the key for the map, the Redevelopment Zone has not been identified on the map itself. The terminology “ <i>upper floor development of other uses, such as residential, ...</i> ” is too imprecise.
24	A (a)	CNDP1	Developers are advised to “ <i>Take their design cue from the best examples ...</i> ”, but where are these identified in the plan? Alternatively list the essential elements to be found in a good frontage.
24	A (c)	CNDP1	The phrase “ <i>affect key uses</i> ” is too imprecise.

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
	A	CNDP1	Reference is made to “ <i>small or piecemeal proposals</i> ”. How is it possible to assess how any development will prejudice long-term comprehensive redevelopment, when these proposals have not been set out?
24	B (2)	CNDP1	Whilst it is preferable to plant native trees it is more important to plant species that are appropriate to the location in which they are to be situated. Limiting the policy to native trees alone will severely restrict the type of trees that can be planted.
24	B	CNDP1	This element of the policy needs tightening up if it is to be used by officers in Development Management.
25	C	CNDP1	This element of the policy represents a blanket ban on hot food takeaways and is not compliant with higher order policy.
25	6.1.2	-	Policy CNDP1 appears to be silent in reference to retail applications intended to serve a borough-wide catchment.
26	6.1.4	-	As noted previously, the extent of the Town Centre Redevelopment Zone needs to be shown on the Policies Map (Inset Map 5) Typo: Reference should be to Policy CNDP1
			Policy CNDP1 – While it is good to plant native trees it is more important to plant trees that are appropriate to the situation that they are growing in. Limiting it to native trees will restrict the number of species that can be planted in the street scene without causing damage. For instance, quite a few of the trees we have in Nelson Town Centre would not be considered native but they are appropriate for street planting, look good and provide food and habitat for various species. Furthermore, climatic change may alter the range of species that we can plant in the future.
27	-	CNDP2	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
27	-	CNDP2	The policy should start with retention and repair then move onto new shopfront design.
27	A	CNDP2	What is meant by “ <i>traditional construction</i> ” and is it appropriate for all buildings? Replace with the phrase “ <i>traditional design and appearance</i> ” which is more accurate. Important to link references to “ <i>traditional construction/design</i> ” to the character of the building concerned – modern good quality contemporary designs may be more appropriate in a relatively new building. The Council’s Conservation Area SPD sets out the elements of traditional shopfront design.
27	B	CNDP2	Well maintained blinds and canopies can add to the streetscape, but of poorly maintained can soon detract from its appearance. Why are they being encouraged if they are not “ <i>traditional</i> ”. Need to define what is meant by “ <i>better</i> ” – Canvas? No plastics? Complementary to the street scene etc. Is a total ban on external shutters appropriate? Can it be justified?
-	-	CNDP2	No reference or cross reference is made to accessibility requirements.
27	6.1.6 & 6.1.7	-	The justification for the policy needs to be strengthened.

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
28	-	CNDP3	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
28	6.2	-	The word <i>“protect”</i> is not generally used in heritage policy. Suggest this opening is replaced with: <i>“To conserve and enhance the historic environment and character of Colne including its Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and non-designated Heritage Assets ...”</i>
28	6.2.1	-	Why does this paragraph precede the policy? This is inconsistent with the layout for most other policies in the plan.
28	-	CNDP3	The policy is related to general design principles rather than heritage and should be badged as such. It appears to be applicable to the whole of Colne rather than just the historic environment. Suggest that it would be better to start with this general design policy, then move onto heritage specific issues (e.g. CNDP2). Consider a separate policy for designated Heritage Assets then non-designated Heritage Assets, which can include urban character areas. Refers to the <i>“the key attributes of the best built environment and design features...”</i> but does not define these attributes more closely. Are these the elements that are illustrated in the street-scene photomontages that are included towards the end of the document? Any heritage policy should refer to the need for <i>“heritage balancing”</i> in order to be wholly consistent with national policy.
28	-	CNDP3	The <i>“best built environment and design features”</i> need to be clearly articulated, so that anyone using the plan is aware of what they are. Development that has an adverse impact on a particular building may not have <i>“a significant adverse impact on the character of the area”</i> . Is the policy saying this is acceptable?
24	(c)	CNDP3	Whilst it is preferable to plant native trees it is more important to plant species that are appropriate to the location in which they are to be situated. Limiting the policy to native trees alone will severely restrict the type of trees that can be planted.
28	a	-	Good examples of design from one part of the town, will not necessarily represent appropriate design in another part of the town. The policy should refer to good design that enhances and is appropriate to the immediate locality
28	b	-	The phrase <i>“larger proposals”</i> would be better phrased as <i>“major development”</i> as this is quantifiable.
29	f	CNDP3	The phrase <i>“will be conserved”</i> is too strong. It needs to reflect the heritage balance.
29	6.2.2	-	The phrase <i>“will be conserved”</i> is too strong. It needs to reflect the heritage balance.
			Policy CNDP3 – Same comment as CNDP1 Map 1 – Would the map boundary not be better if it was the banks of the reservoirs?

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
30	-	CNDP4	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
30	-	CNDP4	<p>Listings should avoid any reference to the current occupier of the premises, as this is likely to change over time.</p> <p>The list should be accompanied by a detailed Appendix, which includes full details for each asset (e.g. Reference, Name, Location, Brief Description, Principles for listing (including group value), Key Features) and conform with the guidance set out in Historic England Advice Note 7: Local Heritage Listing.</p> <p>Listings should avoid any reference to the current occupier of the premises, as this is likely to change over time.</p> <p>The phrase “<i>will be conserved</i>” is too strong. It needs to reflect the heritage balance.</p> <p>The phrase “<i>Special attention will be given to the conservation of the following non-designated Heritage assets ..</i>” fails to recognise that other NDHAs may come to light in the future and should also be taken account of. The term “<i>special attention</i>” is generally reserved for designated Heritage Assets. It would be better to say something like “<i>The following assets are identified as making a valuable contribution to local character and distinctiveness ...</i>”</p>
31	6.2.4	-	Should the paragraph after the quote from the NPPF be numbered?
32	-	CNDP5	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
32	-	-	<p>Unclear what this policy adds to CNDP3 and CNDP4.</p> <p>The areas listed and shown on the policies map are considered to be worthy of identification as Urban Character Areas.</p> <p>The three-storey cottages at Castle are also considered to be worthy of non-designated Heritage Asset status (CNDP4).</p>
32	-	CNDP5	<p>The opening of the policy would be better worded as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The boundaries of the following Urban Character Areas are defined on the Policies Map: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UCA/01 – Castle and Castle Road UCA/02 – Chatham Street / Montague Street / Langroyd UCA/03 – Keighley Road UCA/04 – Newmarket Street Within a designated Urban Character Area new development should seek to ...
32	-	CNDP5	<p>Some of the requirements listed here would be better in a general design policy (CNDP3).</p> <p>References to “<i>Yorkshire Stone</i>” would be better in a more general reference to “<i>stone flags, setts and slates</i>” as the stone is most likely to have been sourced from within Lancashire.</p>
32	B	CNDP5	<p>The use of “<i>traditional</i>” materials may no longer be appropriate (e.g. hardwoods in shop frontages). In these circumstances the policy needs to be clear that the materials used should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> recycled, or mainstream products with higher recycled content; appropriate to their setting; and

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> make a positive contribution to the overall quality of the environment
34	-	CNDP6	This policy is <u>not</u> considered to meet the Basic Conditions , for some or all of the reasons outlined below.
34	-	CNDP6	<p>The proposed site allocations do <u>not</u> represent a deliverable or balanced portfolio of sites for future housing provision in Colne.</p> <p>Deliverable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Policy Guidance is clear that viability must be considered when preparing neighbourhood plans. The evidence on viability prepared for Colne Town Council (Aecom, 2019) was not available to view on the Town Council website, so it is unclear whether the sites identified in this policy are considered to viable to develop for housing. If they are not viable, they would fail to meet the deliverability test in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). No evidence is presented to demonstrate that a developer intends to deliver housing on these sites during the plan period. Assessment of sites – it is not evident how the scores for individual criteria have been determined. <p>Balanced Portfolio</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sites selected will not deliver the variety of house type and tenure required to address local housing needs.
34	-	CNDP6	The majority of sites have been taken from Pendle Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Using the same site description would help to avoid any potential for confusion. For example CNDP/1 " <i>Land rear of Belgrave Road</i> " is described in the SHLAA as " <i>Land adjacent to 43 Belgrave Road</i> ", which offers a more accurate description.
34	-	CNDP6	It would be useful if the Policies Map (and Inset) identified individual Housing Allocations by their reference number (see comments on Appendices below).
34	-	CNDP6/1	<p>Land off Waterside Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P037 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been selected for allocation. Is there evidence of the landowner's intention to sell the site for housing? Recent investment at the site by owner Northern Polytunnels suggests that any intentions to sell the site, at least in the short-term, may have changed. The northern part of the site is designated as open space – Natural Greenspace (NG118) and Amenity Greenspace (AG139).
34	-	CNDP6/2	<p>Land adjacent to 43 Belgrave Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P202 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold.
34	-	CNDP6/3	<p>Storage Compound</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P145 was promoted for employment in the Pendle Local Plan. Is there evidence of the landowner's intention to sell the site for housing? The site is currently occupied by a caravan storage business.
34	-	CNDP6/4	<p>Former Kippax Biscuits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P147 was promoted for employment in the Pendle Local Plan.

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there evidence of the landowner's intention to sell the site for housing? The adjacent mill (excluded from the allocation) was recently occupied by a new commercial venture (Earnie's).
34	-	CNDP6/5	<p>Land at Dam Side</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P054 was promoted for open space in the Pendle Local Plan. Is there evidence of the landowner's intention to sell the site for housing? The site is currently occupied by a caravan storage business. The site is almost wholly within Flood Zone 3, so the development would fail the Sequential Test. Has a Flood Risk Assessment been produced to address the Exception Test?
34	-	CNDP6/6	<p>Walk Mill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P022 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been selected for allocation. Is there evidence of the landowner's intention to sell the site for housing? Large tracts of the site are within Flood Zone 3. Has a Flood Risk Assessment been produced?
34	-	CNDP6/7	<p>Shaw Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site was not put forward for consideration in the Pendle Local Plan. The site is currently designated as open space – Play Area (PA014/015) and Woodland (WD374) Is this the same site as CNDP7/8 (unclear as sites are not identified on the Policies Map.)? If it is the allocation of this site for housing would contradict Policy CNDP7 (see below), where it is proposed to protect the site as Open Space.
34	-	CNDP6/8	<p>Bridge Street Stoneyard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P021 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been selected for allocation. Is there evidence of the landowner's intention to sell the site for housing? The site is currently occupied by Bridge Street Stone.
34	-	CNDP6/9	<p>Land off Bridge Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P086 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been selected for allocation. Is there evidence of the landowner's intention to sell the site for housing? The site is currently occupied by Bridge Street Stone.
34	-	CNDP6/10	<p>Green Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P053 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been selected for allocation. Is development of the site for housing viable, in view of the severe contamination issues on this site?
34	-	CNDP6/11	<p>Knotts Drive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsure about the specific location of this proposed site allocation, as sites are not identified individually on the Policies Map.
34	-	CNDP6/12	<p>Windy Bank</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site CE144 already benefits from planning permission for housing (17/0005/FUL – 22 apartments). It is included in the existing commitments for Colne and should not feature in the list of allocations.


Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
34	-	CNDP6/13	North Street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site was not put forward for consideration in the Pendle Local Plan. It is a vacant site, formerly occupied by lock-up garages.
34	-	CNDP6/14	Land at Hawley Street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P038 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold. The site is currently in use as a car park. Is it available for development?
34	-	CNDP6/15	Land adjacent to 6 Knotts Lane <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P039 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold. The site is designated as open space (AG174)
34	-	CNDP6/16	Thomas Street Car Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P092 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold. The site is currently in use as a car park. Is it available for development?
34	-	CNDP6/17	Land adjacent to 34 Lenches Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P118 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold.
34	-	CNDP6/18	Tower Buildings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site was not put forward for consideration in the Pendle Local Plan. Existing buildings, formerly occupied by a night club. Conversion to residential may be possible via permitted development rights. Is a 'restrictive' allocation for housing appropriate in this instance?
		CNDP6/19	Land South of Red Scar Works <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P142 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been selected for allocation. It is currently used for open storage.
		CNDP6/20	Land to rear of Dewhurst Street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P084 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold.
		CNDP6/21	Land off Hartleys Terrace <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P093 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been selected for allocation.
		CNDP6/22	Land at Primrose Hill <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P204 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold.
		CNDP6/23	Land adjacent to 271 Keighley Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site P201 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold.
		CNDP6/24	Land south of Colne Water

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site P067 was promoted for employment in the Pendle Local Plan. • The site is currently occupied by ELE Advanced Technologies (formerly Earby Light Engineering). The owners are known to be exploring opportunities to relocate the business. • Parts of the site are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Has a Flood Risk Assessment been produced?
		CNDP6/25	<p>Land adjacent to 47 Townley Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site P199 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold.
		CNDP6/26	<p>Land adjacent to 43 Belgrave Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site P202 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been considered for allocation as it falls below the 0.25 hectare size threshold.
		CNDP6/27	<p>Bunkers Hill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site CE127 already benefits from planning permission for housing (13/12/063P – 30, 2/3 bed homes). It is included in the existing commitments for Colne and should not feature in the list of allocations. • Development of this larger area was rejected by Pendle Council due to new tree planting on this part of the site.
		CNDP6/28	<p>Spring Gardens Mill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site P023 was promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but has not been selected for allocation. • Is there evidence of the landowner's intention to sell the site for housing? Pendle Council understands that industrial/commercial use of this site is preferred. • Parts of the site are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Has a Flood Risk Assessment been produced?
34	-	CNDP6	The total number of dwellings on the sites identified add up to 808, rather than 705 as stated in the text below.
34	-	CNDP6	<p>The application of an average density of 30 dpa is inappropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inner urban sites, in accessible locations, are typically capable of accommodating much higher densities. In contrast lower density development may be appropriate at sites which mark the transition between the urban area and the open countryside. The approach of the Neighbourhood Plan is contrary to the NPPF which seeks higher density development in accessible and sustainable locations within settlements to make effective use of land. 2. The use of a blanket 30 dpa figure does not allow for an accurate assessment of site viability. As such the deliverability of the proposed site allocations cannot be considered to have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.
34	-	CNDP6	A blanket refusal not to support development " <i>beyond the settlement boundary</i> " is contrary to the NPPF and strategic policies in the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.
34	6.3.2	-	It is too simplistic to say that the standard method shows an annual requirement of 146dpa for Pendle. Government guidance is clear that this

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
			figure is only the starting point for determining the local housing requirement. The Housing Needs Assessment does more than just consider “ <i>if exceptional circumstances exist for departing from the govt’s methodology.</i> ” As written the paragraph doesn’t reflect the whole process.
37	6.3.3	-	Reference is made to the viability assessment being available on the Town Council website, but links to this document; and some other supporting information could not be found on either the Neighbourhood Plan page or the Town Council website.
37	6.3.4	-	There is some wording missing from the second sentence.
	-	CNDP7	This policy is <u>not</u> considered to meet the Basic Conditions , for some or all of the reasons outlined below.
38	6.3.5	-	Why does this paragraph precede the policy? This is inconsistent with the layout for most other policies in the plan.
38	-	CNDP7	Consider using similar opening text to that suggested for Policy CNDP5 (see above).
38	-	CNDP7	The designation of Local Green Space must be carried out in accordance with the criteria contained in the NPPF (paragraph 100). The list of sites should be accompanied by a detailed Appendix, which includes full details for each asset (e.g. Reference, Name, Location, Brief Description, Principles for designation, Key Features)
38	-	CNDP7/1	<p>Alkincoates Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typo: There is no “e” in Alkincoates (see Current OS Maps and Historic OS 1:2500 Map extract (c.1890) below for confirmation). The confusion arises from a leaflet published a few years ago for the Local Nature Reserve, which had this incorrect spelling prominently displayed on the front cover.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site (PK027, PA044 and OS072) is designated as open space (various typologies) in the Pendle Open Space Audit.
38	-	CNDP7/2	<p>Upper Rough</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree • This is an extensive tract of land, on the edge of the settlement and does not have distinct boundaries on all sides. It does not meet the requirement for designation as a Local Green Space.
38	-	CNDP7/3	<p>Lidgett Triangle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Although it could be regarded as an extensive tract of land, the site has very distinct boundaries and makes a significant contribution to the

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
			character of the Lidgett and Bents Conservation Area, and the setting of Higher Standroyd on Skipton Old Road.
38	-	CNDP7/4	Colne Cemetery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • The site (CM003) is designated as a Cemetery in the Pendle Open Space Audit.
38	-	CNDP7/5	Heifer Lane roundabout <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree – How is this site of particular importance to the local community?
38	-	CNDP7/6	St Stephen's Walking Area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree – The site (AG092) is designated as Amenity Greenspace in the Pendle Open Space Audit. This designation is considered to be sufficient for this site.
38	-	CNDP7/7	Byron Road Community Area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree • How is this site of particular importance to the local community? • The site (AG093) is designated as Amenity Greenspace in the Pendle Open Space Audit. • May be worth considering designation of the facility as an Asset of Community Value.
38	-	CNDP7/8	Hagg Green Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • The site (AG162/WD472) is designated as Amenity Greenspace and Woodland in the Pendle Open Space Audit.
38	-	CNDP7/9	Waterside Millennium Green <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • The site (PK029/PA060) is designated as a Park and Play Area in the Pendle Open Space Audit.
38	-	CNDP7/10	Whitewalls Green Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree • How is this of particular importance to the local community? • From the Policies Map the site appears to be the inaccessible central area of the roundabout at the end of the M65, which cannot be considered to be demonstrably special to the local community.
38	-	CNDP7/11	Casserley Road/Varley Street/Thorn Grove <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. • Note: The correct name for this site is the King George V Playing Fields • The site is designated as open space (various typologies) • The site (PA022/PA042a/PA042b/K029/OS095) is designated as open space (various typologies) in the Pendle Open Space Audit.
38	-	CNDP7/12	Snell Grove <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree • The site (AG090) is designated as Amenity Greenspace in the Pendle Open Space Audit. This designation is considered to be sufficient for this site.

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
38	-	CNDP7/13	Ferndean Way in Waterside <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree This is a linear route and does not meet the requirement for designation as Local Green Space.
38	-	CNDP7/14	Ball Grove Park and Nature Reserve <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree The site (PK006/PA030/NG018/WD106) is designated as open space (various typologies) in the Pendle Open Space Audit.
39	6.3.8	-	Typo: The misspelling of Alkincoats is repeated on the caption for the photo, which follows this paragraph (see comment on CNDP7/1 above).
39	6.3.9	-	The phrase <i>“the neighbourhood area’s remaining open spaces”</i> is too vague, as there are many open spaces to which this policy is not intended to apply.
	-	CNDP8	This policy meets the Basic Conditions , but is considered to be unnecessary for some or all of the reasons outlined below.
40	-	-	Policy does not designate further Open Space, or offer additional protection to that afforded by the Local Plan Policy ENV1. It is not necessary. For clarity not all designated open space is shown on the Proposals Map accompanying the Pendle Local Plan. Designated sites which fall below the 0.4 hectare threshold are only shown in the Pendle Open Space Audit.
40	A	CNDP8	What is a <i>“reasonable walking distance”</i> considered to be? – 5 / 10 / 15 mins? Should an additional allowance, if steep slopes are encountered along the route, be included?
	-	CNDP9	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
41	-	-	The policy does not offer additional protection to that afforded by Policy SUP1 in the Pendle Local Plan. For the policy to be worthwhile it needs to be more specific.
	-	CNDP10	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
42	-	-	No further comments on this policy.
	-	CNDP11	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
42	-	-	There is significant cross over with Policy CNDP8 (above) and policy does not offer additional protection to that afforded by Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan.
42	-	-	Policy does not offer additional protection to that afforded by the Local Plan Policy ENV1. The use of reference numbers, which differ from those in the Council’s Open Space Audit, is unhelpful. CNDP11/1
42	-	CNDP11/1	King George V Playing Field <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been designated as Local Green Space (CNDP7/11). Designated open space (OS095) the site is afforded protection Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan.

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are multiple policy designations necessary?
42	-	CNDP11/2	<p>Millennium Green</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been designated as Local Green Space (CNDP7/9), where it is referenced as Waterside Millennium Green. Designated open space (PK029/PA060) the site is afforded protection Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan. Are multiple policy designations necessary?
42	-	CNDP11/3	<p>Holt House including playing fields, Colne FC and Colne and Nelson Rugby Club</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated open space (OS071) the site is afforded protection Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan. Are multiple policy designations necessary?
42	-	CNDP11/4	<p>Colne Cricket Club</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated open space (OS071) the site is afforded protection Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan. Are multiple policy designations necessary?
42	-	CNDP11/5	<p>Colne Golf Club</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated open space (OS007) the site is afforded protection Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan. Are multiple policy designations necessary?
42	-	CNDP11/6	<p>West Craven Tennis Club</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The private courts on Bents Lane are owned by the <u>Craven</u> Tennis Club.
42	-	CNDP11/7	<p>Pendle Leisure Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why has the associated car parking been excluded from the area shown on the Policies Map?
42	-	CNDP11/8	<p>Bowling green, Colne Cricket Club</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated open space (OS097) the site is afforded protection Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan. Are multiple policy designations necessary?
43	-	CNDP11/9	<p>Bowling green, British Legion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated open space (OS081) the site is afforded protection Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan. Are multiple policy designations necessary?
43	-	CNDP11/10	<p>Sports pitches/playing fields at former Nelson and Colne College</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated open space (OS081) the site is afforded protection Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan. Are multiple policy designations necessary? Sites P083 and P011 incorporate the playing fields. Both were promoted for housing in the Pendle Local Plan, but neither has been selected for allocation.
44	-	CNDP12	<p>This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions, but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.</p>
44	-	-	<p>Policy does not offer additional protection to that afforded by Policy ENV1 in the Pendle Local Plan.</p>

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
			The use of reference numbers, which differ from those in the Council's Open Space Audit, is unhelpful.
		CNDP12/1 to CNDP12/14	<p>Various allotment sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are all the allotment sites designated in the Pendle Open Space Audit included here? Are there additional allotment sites that need to be included in the Pendle Open Space Audit? Is a further allotment designation in the CNDP necessary?
		CNDP12/1	Typo: The misspelling of Alkincoats is repeated here (see comment on CNDP7/1 above).
45	-	CNDP13	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
45	-	-	As written this does not constitute a planning policy.
45	-	-	<p>Note: The Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) is relatively old and uses a time/distance measurement, which is often inconsistent with site assessment work, and hence other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The standard measure for walking distance is 80 metres for one minute of walking time, except where an allowance is also made for any steep slopes encountered along the route. As such a 5 minute walk should equate to 400 metres, a ten minute walk 800 metres etc.</p>
46	-	CNDP14	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
46	-	CNDP14	<p>As written this does not constitute a planning policy.</p> <p>Why does the 'policy' only support electrified rail links? Modern bi-modal trains offer considerable customer benefits in enabling through journeys beyond the electrified network.</p> <p>Is the route of the bypass supported, irrespective of the route chosen?</p>
48	-	CNDP15	This policy is considered to meet the Basic Conditions , but elements need to be re-written so that its requirements are clear for both developers and planning officers.
48	-	CNDP15	<p>South Pennines NCA – There are no tracts of open expansive moorland within the designated neighbourhood area.</p> <p>The policy mentions prominent views, but does not identify where these are within the town. It is highly unlikely that new development will be feasible without affecting views of one or more of the key features listed.</p>
48	6.4.1	-	<p>As no part of the AONB lies within the neighbourhood area, would it not be simpler to say:</p> <p><i>"Policy ENV1 of the PLPCS states that in areas such as Colne, which are not subject to national landscape designations, development proposals should ..."</i></p>
48	6.4.5 & 6.4.6	-	Rather than repeat the content of two documents, which may be updated during the lifetime of the CNDP, it is sufficient to note here that there are differences between the two documents and to include a reference to each document in the Bibliography.
51	-	CNDP16	This policy is <u>not</u> considered to meet the Basic Conditions , for some or all of the reasons outlined below.

Colne Neighbourhood Plan Comments on Regulation 14 Draft

Page	Para	Policy	Comments / Suggested Amendments
51	-	CNDP16	The policy seeks to control development in the countryside, but Policy CNDP6 clearly states that <i>“Development beyond the settlement boundary will not be supported”</i> .
51	B	CNDP16	It would be better to refer to <i>“traditional rural buildings of permanent construction ...”</i> to help avoid inadvertently supporting development where temporary agricultural buildings have been site.
51	E	CNDP16	The use of <i>“traditional”</i> or <i>“local”</i> materials may no longer be appropriate, or possible. Supporting development that is of a <i>“traditional design and appearance”</i> offers greater flexibility in sourcing appropriate materials.
7. How to Comment			
53	-	-	<p>The failure to formally notify and supply a copy of the plan to Pendle Council, prior to the start of the public consultation, could be considered to be a failure to comply with Regulation 14 (c).</p> <p>To comply with Regulation 14(b) the consultation bodies in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 were formally notified of the consultation and given not less than six weeks to respond.</p> <p>Pendle Council acknowledges that the deadline for interested parties to comment on the plan was extended from 14 December 2020 to 8 January 2021.</p> <p>In addition to publishing the CNDP online, the Town Council has clearly taken innovative steps (e.g. innovative online workshops and booking system) to ensure that the local community has had every chance to comment on the CNDP during the COVID-19 Lockdown.</p> <p>However, some of the basic requirements established in Government Regulations and Guidance have not been followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to formally notify the local planning authority (and other prescribed bodies?) • Failure to make key evidence base documents available to view • Failure to adequately identify key designations on site plans and/or maps <p>As such Pendle Council does not consider that the local community, key stakeholders and prescribed bodies have had adequate opportunity to consider the implications of the plan proposals in sufficient detail.</p>
8. Appendices			
-	-	Policies Map	<p>The weblink refers to the <i>“Proposals Map”</i>. This is no longer the Government’s preferred terminology and the correct term <i>“Policies Map”</i> is used elsewhere in the CNDP.</p> <p>Individual site allocations (e.g. housing, local green space etc.) should be identified by their reference number.</p> <p>Individual sites are not referenced on the Policies Map or Inset Map. As such the location and extent of the proposed allocations / designations (e.g. Local Green Space sites) will not be evident to many readers.</p>
54	-	Inset Map 5	<p>Would suggest that the junction of Windy Bank and Church Street/Market Street is also a key gateway.</p> <p>The Redevelopment Zone shown in the key and referred to in policy is not shown on the map.</p> <p>Individual site allocations (e.g. housing, local green space etc.) should be identified by their reference number.</p>