

Subject:	Responses Received to Local Plan Green Belt Boundary Changes Re-consultation and Adopted Statement of Community Involvement consultation	Status:	For Publication
Report to:	Council	Date:	25 th February 2015
Report of:	Planning Manager	Portfolio Holder:	Operational Services and Development Control
Key Decision:	<input type="checkbox"/> Forward Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Exception	<input type="checkbox"/> Special Urgency <input type="checkbox"/>
Equality Impact Assessment:	Required:	Yes/No	Attached: Yes/No
Biodiversity Impact Assessment	Required:	Yes/No	Attached: Yes/No
Contact Officer:	Adrian Smith/Anne Storah	Telephone:	01706 252418/9
	adriansmith@rossendalebc.gov.uk/annestorah@rossendalebc.gov.uk		

1.	RECOMMENDATION(S)
1.1	That Council notes the comments received on the Green Belt re-consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

2.1 To inform members of the results of the recent consultations on the Green Belt Boundary Changes and the Statement of Community Involvement and the main implications.

3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 The matters discussed in this report impact directly on the following corporate priorities:

- **Regenerating Rossendale:** This priority focuses on regeneration in its broadest sense, so it means supporting communities that get on well together, attracting sustainable investment, promoting Rossendale, as well as working as an enabler to promote the physical regeneration of Rossendale.
- **Responsive Value for Money Services:** This priority is about the Council working collaboratively, being a provider, procurer and a commissioner of services that are efficient and that meet the needs of local people.
- **Clean Green Rossendale:** This priority focuses on clean streets and town centres and well managed open spaces, whilst recognising that the Council has to work with communities and as a partner to deliver this ambition.

4. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 All the issues raised and the recommendation(s) in this report involve risk considerations as set out below:

- Progressing with the proposed boundary changes will invoke continued opposition from both developers and local residents
- There is a risk of future legal challenge
- Some developers will proceed with planning applications in the Green Belt prior to the Plan being adopted.

5. BACKGROUND AND OPTIONS

- 5.1 The Green Belt re-consultation was undertaken in response to correspondence received on the soundness of the Council's approach and subsequent legal advice. The purpose was to advertise the potential amendments that are being proposed and to invite comments from all stakeholders with an interest in development in Rossendale. Additional information from the landscape assessment work supported the consultation.
- 5.2 The Statement of Community Involvement was adopted at Council on 17th December 2014, as the Council's approach to consultation on planning issues, subject to feedback from a six week public consultation, and with all future minor amendments to be delegated to the Director of Business in consultation with the Portfolio Holder. The consultation ran from 18th December to 23rd January. The consultation has now ended and the changes are being incorporated as appropriate, subject to agreement with the Director of Business and the Portfolio Holder.
- Green Belt re-consultation*
- 5.3 In total 127 comments were received to the consultation. This includes consultees who have made multiple comments. Over 80 of these were from individual residents and ten from residents associations. Eleven were received from developers with 26 from public bodies and interest groups.
- 5.4 The greatest number of comments related to proposals in the south west of the Borough, particularly around Edenfield. The individual sites that attracted the most attention were Long Acres Farm, Whitworth where residents supported the land being placed in Green Belt, while land at Kirkhill Drive, Haslingden also attracted a high number of comments. Two additional sites were proposed as part of the re-consultation at Cowm Water Treatment Works and land at Riverside Business Park, Rawtenstall.
- 5.5 All of the comments received are appended to this Report – Appendix 1.
- 5.6 A number of respondents made comments about changes to the Urban Boundary in other parts of the Borough. While these are not directly relevant to this consultation, they will be considered in the development of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD.
- 5.7 *SCI consultation*
Appendix 2 lists the 16 comments that were received on the Statement of Community Involvement. A number of respondents observed that it was easier to follow than the previous edition and was well written. An agent suggested a number of changes to the Development Control Charter including how the Planning Unit communicates with developers. One respondent was disappointed about the diminishing role of Area Forums, but this is not strictly an SCI but a corporate issue. Finally there were suggestions about improving the Council's website; involving local interest groups more effectively; and not seeing consultation as a "box-ticking" exercise.
- 5.8 A number of changes will be made, where appropriate, to the SCI to take the above comments into account.

COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY OFFICERS:

6. SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 6.1 The Council's Estates department are currently in the process of feeding back to the Forward

Planning Team regarding areas of Green Belt in order to contribute from the perspective of the Council's own land ownership.

7. MONITORING OFFICER

7.1 All legal implications are commented upon in the body of the report.

8. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT

8.1 The Green Belt re-consultation is intended to inform the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD, as set out in Policy 1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2011).

8.2 The Green Belt re-consultation ran from 11th November 2014 for six weeks to 23rd December. The consultation was available to view on the Council's website and copies of the Report were available to view in all of the Borough's libraries and at the Council's One Stop Shop. Leaflets and posters were also placed on Stan the Van and in the Borough's libraries, advertising the consultation. Additionally in areas of significant proposed larger changes households were leafleted, and posters were placed on lamp posts. A number of roadshow events with the public were undertaken in the six identified Vision Areas, with members of the Forward Planning team available to discuss and explain the proposed amendments. An advertisement was placed in the Rossendale Free Press and the Manchester Evening News.

8.3 The Statement of Community Involvement sets out how the Planning Authority will consult on planning matters – both in respect of the Development Plan and in relation to Development Control matters.

8.4 The SCI consultation was sent to everyone on the Forward Planning consultation database, and was placed on the Council's website. This covers a wide range of interested parties.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 The Green Belt re-consultation has drawn out very similar responses to the previous consultation, albeit with two additional proposed changes put forward. There remains a clear division between local residents who want to protect the Green Belt because they value the openness and local landscape and developers/landowners who would like to bring forward development, which would meet the Borough's needs for housing and employment land. In some cases it will not be possible to reconcile these opposing views.

9.2 The Forward Planning team will consider the responses received and their implications for the preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD *Lives and Landscapes*, Part 2 of the Local Plan.

9.3 The responses to the Statement of Community Involvement are generally supportive with some specific comments, particularly in relation to how planning applications are dealt with. The document is being amended where appropriate to take comments into account and all future minor amendments will be delegated for approval to the Director of Business in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.

Background Papers

Document	Place of Inspection
<p>Appendix 1: Representations received on the Re-consultation on Amendments to the Green Belt (November/December 2015)</p> <p>Appendix 2: Representations received on the Statement of Community Involvement (December 2014/January 2015).</p> <p>Statement of Community Involvement - 2014</p>	<p>One Stop Shop, The Business Centre, Futures Park, Bacup, OL13 0BB</p> <p>www.rossendale.gov.uk/land</p>

Green Belt Re-consultation Comments

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
AREA		Bacup							
27	Resident	GB	Land at bottom of Four Lane Ends Road	BSBW(GB)102	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
25	Resident	GB	Bacup and Stacksteads Area		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	I have seen and discussed the proposed changes to Bacup and Stacksteads areas. They seem fair and logical, so shall not raise any objections.
AREA		General							
74	Partner	GB			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence inviting comments on the above changes.</p> <p>I have assessed the document with regard to County Council's strategic objectives and priorities, functions and other material considerations and welcome the Green Belt Review.</p> <p>I have no comments to make on this consultation.</p>
43	Partner	GB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Thank you for your email dated 14th November 2014 regarding the re-consultation on proposed changes to the current Green Belt Boundary. The information attached to this consultation, has been produced in response to the comments received to a previous consultation (in late 2012) in terms of amendments to the issues that relate to green belt boundaries. The suitability of these sites for development will be considered as part of the Local Plan 2 for Rossendale (site allocations), therefore at this stage, English Heritage do not have any comments to make.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
42	Resident	GB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>In general, I am opposed to any erosion of the Green Belt. Your Council is to be applauded for employing Compulsory Purchase Orders where houses have lain empty for years. We should follow the CPO route, vigorously, and supplement this policy by promoting the development of Brownfield Sites. These complementary policies would replace eyesores with new build, whilst sparing our precious Green Belt.</p> <p>I do hope my views will be brought to the attention of the relevant persons, and am confident that many other respondents will share them.</p>
41	Partner	GB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>I would like to confirm that Blackburn with Darwen Council does not have any comments to make, at this stage in the preparation of your Local Plan Part 2, on the review and proposed changes to your Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>We look forward to ongoing cooperation as subsequent stages of the Plan are developed.</p>
7	Partner	GB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above document. Having reviewed the document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make at this stage.</p>
28	Partner	GB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The consultation which we have been offered the opportunity to comment on is of a low risk/priority for Natural England and so we will not be offering representations at this time. The lack of further comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to make comments that will help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of the environmental value of areas affected by this plan in the decision making process. We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
1	Partner	GB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Our key interest is with regard to the strategic road network (SRN) in the borough area .i.e. the A56 trunk road. Essentially we would reiterate comments made on the previous consultation in 2013 in that the proposed boundaries should not compromise the ability of the Agency to safely and effectively manage transport infrastructure within the A56 corridor to allow us to maintain journey reliability. We must retain the scope and potential to conduct both routine maintenance activities and deliver improvement schemes, as indicated above, for the safety of road users and to enhance the efficiency of the SRN.</p> <p>Other than the above, the Agency has no further comments to make regarding the proposed boundary changes.</p>
113	Developer	GB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
114	Partner	GB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Dear Forward Planning Team,</p> <p>1. The Lancashire Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on this local plan consultation. The aim of our charity is to help raise awareness of rural issues to support plan making to deliver policies that positively protect and enhance our countryside assets for the benefit of all in the future. Rossendale has some lovely rural places that our charity wishes to protect for food production, employment and enjoyment by future generations. Once countryside has gone, it has gone for good.</p> <p>2. Earlier this year our Branch of CPRE showed that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is causing local authorities to release greenfield land, including Green Belt, for housing development to satisfy the viability or 'high developer margins' aspects of the five year housing land supply rule (report available on our website).</p> <p>3. This aspect carries more weight in decision making than any other material consideration. Of course we agree authorities should plan ahead and ensure sufficient land is in the pipeline to provide much needed housing, but the emphasis should be on finding sustainable sites and achieving quality urban design. People deserve quality housing with sustainable transport links and adequate local amenities, such as doctors and shops. We fear that the current system promotes 'land-banking' of brownfield sites with planning permission for housing, to trigger permission of greenfield sites. A solution to the stalling of sites is needed. Lancashire's industrial legacy means it has brownfield reserves that ought to be rebuilt in advance of bulldozing farmland and wildlife havens. We are working with Government to try and achieve policy improvements.</p> <p>4. In the meantime we wish to support local authorities to adopt local plans with good policies concerning the countryside, but we acknowledge under the NPPF they must have a robust five year housing land supply as without (as explained above) developers will gain approval to develop land in a speculative and sporadic fashion and this most threatens our rural places. We need good</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>strategic planning based on sustainable development principles.</p> <p>5. Green Belt loss stirs up strong public emotions and opposition. We welcomed the announcement by Communities Secretary Eric Pickles and Housing and Planning Minister Brandon Lewis, on Monday 6th October, who said that thousands of brownfield sites are available for development, and should be prioritised.</p> <p>6. Green Belt is important to CPRE as our countryside charity was involved in this planning policy designation being introduced by Government in the 1950s. Since its introduction Green Belt has been an effective tool for planners in maintaining open green space around our towns and cities for enjoyment – simply because it exists. Green Belts have a higher concentration of public rights of way, broad-leaf and mixed woodland, Country Parks, Local Nature Reserves, and Registered (or historic) Parks and Gardens, than other land. The breakdown of land cover types in the Green Belts are approximately 35% of the area covered by arable / horticultural land; 25% improved grassland, and 14% semi-natural grass.</p> <p>7. We support the Council in securing sustainable land use planning policies, but always prefer to see the reuse of brownfield sites in advance of countryside loss.</p> <p>8. For information our Branch responded to the Green Belt Review for Rawtenstall and Waterfoot, and Whitworth and Bacup in November 2012.</p> <p>9. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
122	Partner	GB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Thank you for your consultation 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 the North West. 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>We understand the Council is currently preparing its Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD, which will form Part 2 of the Local Plan. In order to inform the preparation of the Local Plan Part 2, the Council is required to undertake a review of its existing Green Belt boundary to assess whether it is correct, and also to make room for future development needs.</p> <p>United Utilities now wishes to submit comments to the Council for consideration as part of its Green Belt Re-Consultation. Whilst the formal consultation period has ended, it was agreed with you by email (dated 17 December 2014) that the Council would accept our late representations. As such, we now write to submit the following comments.</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.</p> <p>Whilst it is not for the current Green Belt re-consultation to allocate sites for development, the Council acknowledges that</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>bringing land into the urban boundary “could enable it to be developed”. As such, where the Council has stated support for the removal of land from the Green Belt, for the purpose of these representations we have assumed these sites could come forward for development.</p> <p>We would like to emphasise that new development should be focused in sustainable locations which are accessible to local services. We will be able to most appropriately manage the impact of development if it is in locations where there is access to infrastructure with capacity. As more information becomes available on development proposals such as the approach to surface water drainage and the timing for the delivery of development, which is often only available at the planning application stage, it may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>Many of the rural areas of the Borough will be supported by infrastructure which is proportionate to its rural location. Therefore disproportionate growth in any settlement, especially small settlements, has the potential to place a strain on existing water and wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, we also wish to highlight the importance of surface water draining in the most sustainable way. The hierarchy to be investigated by a developer / applicant when considering a surface water drainage strategy is set out below in the following order of priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) an adequate soak away or some other adequate infiltration system, (approval must be obtained from local authority/building control/Environment Agency); or, where that is not reasonably practicable b) attenuated discharge to watercourse (approval must be obtained from the riparian owner/land drainage authority/Environment Agency); or, where that is not reasonably practicable c) attenuated discharge to surface water sewer (approval must be obtained from United Utilities); or, where that is not reasonably practicable d) attenuated discharge to combined sewer (approval must be obtained from United Utilities).

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
AREA			Haslingden						
33	Resident	GB	Green Belt North of Longshoot/Kirkhill Av	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>We trust the above comments are self-explanatory and will be afforded due consideration by the Council in the preparation of its Local Plan. United Utilities would welcome the opportunity to meet with Rossendale Borough Council to discuss our response in detail. In the meantime, if you have any queries or would like to discuss this representation, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
33	Resident	GB	Green Belt North of Longshoot/Kirkhill Av	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The land at the rear of Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise has significant drainage problems and developing the area will adversely impact upon existing houses. Both roads are currently unadopted and in a deteriorating state and additional traffic will increase the rate of degradation.</p> <p>Removing this land from green belt will reduce distance between settlements and contribute to an urban sprawl reducing distinctive native of Haslingden and Rawtenstall communities. It would adversely impact upon local and longer distance views, reducing the open countryside which is currently available for all to enjoy. Developing the land would remove the current amenity value of the land with footpaths to higher land and a route upto the Halo panoptican.</p> <p>I feel that removing this land from green belt status would be detrimental to the setting of long established settlements on Haslingden Old Road.</p>
4	Resident	GB	Kirkhill Avenue	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>If there is no boundary change then that is great. Problems on Kirkhill: still not adopted fully, road in a deplorable state, solicitors still hold fees for adoption, drainage problems and United Utilities a constant call for problems. Green Belt area fantastic for walking, children playing, sledging, community, wildlife and nature.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
31	Resident	GB	Green Belt to north of Longshoot/Kirkhill	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>For the past 70 years I have been able to site on a form situated on Haslingden Old Road near Kings Lane and enjoy the view but if the present plans go ahead the skyline will be lost for ever.</p> <p>Haslingden Old Road is like a race track at the moment and more traffic will make it even more dangerous. Building more houses will be a grave mistake and I wish to object profoundly to you robbing us of our lovely countryside.</p>
3	Resident	GB	Greenbelt to north of Longshoot / Kirkhill	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>I have been concerned about the proposed changes to classification of this popular and beautiful recreation area. I have specific concerns about reclassification of the landscape assessments subsection area C which is the elevated area of land behind my property at the corner of Sandown Road and Moorland Rise. This is partially cultivated land, criss crossed with footpaths (perhaps unofficial but historically well used) and beautiful moorland grasses and wild flowers. It can be seen for miles across the valley. I am aware that Peel holdings have already prepared plans for housing on this field in preparation for planned boundary change. Any development will adversely impact upon local and longer distance views of this area which can be seen from the halo, to the Grane around to the tor. It will adversely affect countryside views, access from my property and drainage onto my property. It will adversely affect walkers and hikers to this popular area and I am concerned that reclassification will definitely equal development.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
53	Resident	GB	Green belt to north of Longshoot / Kirkhil	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>I moved to Haslingden in 1970 when I was 10 years old. Our 'new build' house on Sandown Road was the last to be built at that stage. During my childhood I spent many a happy day on the hillside playing and running about enjoying the countryside. Over the years, the hillside has been eroded with more and more houses, so that now the gap between the houses on Moreland Rise and Haslingden Old Road measures only a few hundred yards. The importance of maintaining the space can not be understated. Gaps of green belt between housing developments must be maintained for the benefit of all.</p> <p>Even now, 44 years on, I still consider Haslingden and the Rossendale Valley to be 'home'. I visit my family every week and the views from Haslingden Old Road are spectacular. Any development of this green belt would block the view across the valley for ever. It would also deprive other children the opportunity to enjoy a little piece of the countryside close to their existing homes.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
54	Resident	GB	Green Belt to north of Longshoot / Kirkhil	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>I came to live in Haslingden in 1970, to a small town, surrounded by green fields. I walked my dog from Sandown Road up the hillside to Haslingden Old Road, When you get to Haslingden Old Road and look back down the valley across Rawtenstall, Tor View and Haslingden, the view is fantastic you can see for miles. Just a short walk up the hillside out of the town and you feel as if you are on top of the world breathing in fresh air. There is a bench on the corner of Haslingden Old Road (at the bottom of Heightend Farm), it has been there for many, many years (local residents have mentioned 50 years?), I, like a lot of other people have sat on the bench just to rest and take in the view. It is good to stop and look at your world every now and again. Looking at row after row of brick boxes does not have the same up-lifting feeling.</p> <p>There are 30 brown field sites in this valley and 1500 empty houses (figures from the Rossendale Free Press), therefore you do not need to build on any green belt land.</p> <p>You should consult with Liverpool and Blackburn local authorities on their 'good practice' methods, e.g. selling existing terrace houses to young couples for £1, ensuring that these are young couples and residents in the communities and not property developers buying up properties for 'buy to let' portfolios.</p> <p>I believe you should get out from behind your desks and offices and visit the areas of green belt you seem intent on destroying for ever.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
59	Developer	GB	Hazel Mill, Winfields, Blackburn Road, Acr	HRB(GB)207	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The land at Hazel Mill is set lower than the surrounding landscape, with few and then only restricted views available. Furthermore, much of the land is previously developed with a number of buildings having been demolished but still falling with the demise of Winfields, and given over the car parking and occasional storage (subject to the location within the site). In this respect, the Green belt boundary should be drawn around the functional curtilage of the existing operation, as it would not be detrimental to the purpose of allocating land as Green Belt. Indeed, this amendment of the Green Belt boundary would enable the regeneration of partially derelict and vacant previously developed site in preference to greenfield and functional Green Belt land. In this respect the respondent is mindful of the pressures upon greenfield land in order to meet identified housing and employment requirements, and this site could assist in addressing these needs.</p> <p>Please see Supplementary information document: Ref 59 Signet Planning Green+Belt+Review+-+Supplementary+Information</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
63	Resident	GB		HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>To whom it may concern I object to any proposed changes to the site and feel that the area/ fields should be left well alone !</p> <p>I have lived in the Haslingden area for 43 years and have seen a lot of changes over this time to the area of Rossendale . I very much enjoy walking through the hills and fields where the proposed changes are to be made, and i also now enjoy with my daughter and granddaughter showing her the views , animals etc .</p> <p>I would be very dismayed if the planning changes were given the go ahead as I think for the residents in the area would feel very let down by the council.</p> <p>The bench that is positioned by the farm on Kirkhill Road many a topic and time of day has been passed while people young and old catch their breath and the views from there.</p> <p>It is a fantastic place to live with so much green fields and views of the Rossendale Valley - please don't spoil it for the sake of some more houses lets think about the next generations to come and what will they have ?</p> <p>From a traffic perspective come and see how busy the road is already with drivers driving incredibly fast round the bends adding to this would risk more accidents on this very busy road.</p> <p>Fields cannot be grown again when they are gone they are gone .</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>Vicki Riley</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
32	Resident	GB	Green Belt to north of Longshoot/Kirkhill	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>I was born and raised in the area which is in danger of being developed. All my life I have enjoyed the view from the old road over Haslingden and beyond. If it is to be covered with houses it will be a disaster.</p> <p>I spend a lot of time up there and like everybody up there I am appalled at the volume of traffic which uses the road. There has been no attempt at traffic calming and drivers get away with as much speed as they can.</p> <p>As a lifetime Rossendalian I must explore the Council not to pursue the boundary change.</p> <p>I know you are bound to build houses but no there please! John Pilling</p>
69	Developer	GB	Union Road	HRB(GB)107	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	See hyperlink for details

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
35	Resident Group	GB	Land at Winfields, Ormerod Street, Acre,	HRB(GB)207	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. Acre is a Victorian village that incorporates 6 earlier farm estates and looks to be unique in Rossendale as it was built by one woman - Miss Margaret Piling. She built the village to house mill workers from Acre Mill, a co-operative cotton mill that was built at the same time on land Miss Piling also owned. The village has seen very little alteration since construction during the 1860's and 70's so remain an interesting case study of a very small 'model' village. The greenbelt around this village serves to protect the character of this Victorian mill village by preventing unnecessary development, preventing urban spall and maintaining greenbelt separation between the neighbouring town of Haslingden, the village of Rising Bridge and the hamlet of Sherfin.</p> <p>2. The very essence of the greenbelt is its permence and the Government attaches great importance to greenbelts. This importance is demonstrated by how the Government has now (Monday 6 October 2014) spelt out that unmet housing need is NOT an exceptional circumstance. HRB(GB)05 Land at Winfields, Acre has not been identified as required for housing needs nor are there any 'exceptional circumstances' that would permit it to be acceptable or even necessary for it removed from the green belt. Any change to the boundary here would lead to areas or a rural/countryside nature being unnecessarily included in the built up area.</p> <p>3. Current Planning practice guidance says that; the essential characteristics of green belts are their openness and their permanence. The current proposal would encroach into the remaining green belt separation between the village of Acre and the village of Rising Bridge and Hamlet of Sherfin reducing the current distance between settlements and so erode the greenbelt separation.</p> <p>4. The site does not look to be hard standing and instead looks to be bark chippings on the earth of the green belt.</p> <p>5. It is of concern that the landowner has been permitted to encroach onto the green belt in a way that has lead to this proposal to remove some of his land and place it in the urban boundary. Rather than serving to protect the green belt, the</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>proposal HRB(GB)05 Land at Winfields, Acre looks to be regarding these actions and actively encouraging further encroachment into the green belt by Winfield's mill store.</p> <p>6. This area is on the edge of the urban area rather than encompassed by it. For land to be removed from the green belt due to reading as urban, the proposed land would need to be predominantly encompassed by built up from i.e. surrounded on 3 sides by built up area which this proposed land is not. Quite the opposite the land is surrounded by green belt on 3 sides and so reads as green belt and guidelines say must not be removed from the green belt.</p> <p>7. Removing this land from the green belt could encourage development of the land and so adversely impact upon local and longer distance views or detrimentally affect the openness of the Green Belt as it juts out into the green belt.</p> <p>8. Removing this land from the green belt looks to be a contradiction of national policy's intention to protect the green belt, as its removal from the green belt would enclose adjoining green belt and so could create an argument for further adjoining land to later be removed from the green belt, creating urban sprawl and loss of more green belt separation.</p> <p>Diagrams to demonstrate these arguments are on the following page.</p> <p>1. The broken blue line shows how it is proposed to remove a section of the green belt into the urban boundary. It also demonstrates how the plot shares only a very short boundary on one side with the urban boundary and that the majority of this land is bordered by green belt. Guidelines reveal that land that is bordered on 3 sides by green belt remain in the green belt.</p> <p>2. Proposals would see the loss of openness of the green belt and local and longer distance views affected as urban boundary would jut out into the green belt. Further erosion of the green belt could then happen as the adjacent section of green belt would no longer be open and would instead be enclosed on two sides. This</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>action would encourage the argument that the adjacent green belt land now reads as urban and so should also be removed from the green belt.</p> <p>3. This diagram demonstrates the potential long term effect of the current proposal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Erosion and loss of green belt; - Loss of local and longer distance views; - Erosion of the green belt separation between Acre, Rising Bridge and Sherfin; - Encouragement of unnecessary development on the green belt

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
36	Resident Group	GB	Winfield, Haslingden		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Village of Acre</p> <p>Acre is a Victorian village that incorporates 6 earlier farm estates and looks to be unique in Rossendale as it was built by one woman - Miss Margaret Piling. She built the village to house mill workers from Acre Mill, a co-operative cotton mill that was built at the same time on land Miss Piling also owned. The village has seen very little alteration since construction during the 1860's and 70's so remain an interesting case study of a very small 'model' village. The greenbelt around this village serves to protect the character of this Victorian mill village by preventing unnecessary development, preventing urban spall and maintaining greenbelt separation between the neighbouring town of Haslingden, the village of Rising Bridge and the hamlet of Sherfin.</p> <p>1. As explained above Acre is significant in that it is a small model Victorian mill village built by a single person. The heritage value is possibly only highlighted by the fact that the person who built this village was a woman and the mill a co-operative. Unlike conservation areas such as Irwell Vale that have seen much development over the years, Acre has been handed down with next to no development since its inception. The land assessment appears to have completely ignored both these facts and national policy; instead putting forward a proposal that would completely destroys the character, heritage value and setting of this village.</p> <p>2. The very essence of the green belt is its permanence and the Government attaches great importance to green belts. This importance is demonstrated by how the Government has now spelt out that unmet housing need is NOT an exceptional circumstance. Any development in the village's green belt would go against government ruling as it would lead to areas of a rural/countryside nature being unnecessarily included in the built up area.</p> <p>3. Current Planning practice guidance says that; the essential characteristics of green belts are their openness and their permanence. The current proposal would encroach into the remaining green belt separation between the village of Acre and the village of Rising Bridge and hamlet of Sherfin reducing the current distance between settlements and so erode or remove the green belt separation.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>4. Rather than serving to protect the green belt, the proposal looks to aim to create urban sprawl, actively encourages encroachment into the green belt and destroys most of the green belt separation between the village of Acre and the village of Rising Bridge and hamlet of Sherfin.</p> <p>5. National planning policy states that even in exceptional circumstances, development must be small scale and not damage the overall character of an area or increase the built up area of town, village or hamlet by more than 5%. Despite the Government having spelt out that unmet housing need is NOT an exceptional circumstance, these proposals appear to completely ignore national policy and suggest a development that looks to be over 200% of existing settlement.</p> <p>6. To the distress of villagers recent years have seen an erosion of Acre's identity with the village being mis-addressed as Haslingden or Rising Bridge. As a result villagers have spent the last few years campaigning to halt and reverse this erosion. 'Welcome to Acre' signposts have been erected and the Royal Mail have reinstated the correct address for the village by including the village as a locality in their postcode address file. The result being that since October 2013 the official postal address has matched the location address which is: Acre, Rossendale, and Lancashire. Distressingly this assessment appears to have completely ignored the villager's efforts, the correct address and the very existence of this village instead choosing to misleadingly calling the village Haslingden. The proposals then proceeded to compound the issue as whilst they completely ignore the existence of a whole village (Acre) they have chosen to recognise and refer to the neighbouring village of Rising Bridge and the hamlet of Sherfin. It is of note that since its inception Acre has consistently been viewed as a village by Ordnance Survey and is recorded on all of its maps accordingly. As a result it would be impossible to look at an OS map or the postal address file and not be aware of the village's existence.</p> <p>7. Further offence and inaccuracy has been caused by the site being addressed as 'the Winfields site Haslingden'. The site is not in Haslingden, nor is the entire proposed site as marked on the</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>assessments plans owned by Dale Winfield owner of the Winfield mill store which is based in the former Acre Mill (currently addressed as: Hazel Mill, ormerod Street, Acre, Rossendale, Lancashire).</p> <p>8. Removing land from the green belt and development of this green belt land would adversely impact upon local and longer distance views. It would also detrimentally affect the openness of the Green belt as the proposed area juts out into the green belt and any development could be viewed from many places in and around the village and surrounding settlements.</p> <p>9. Removing this land from the green belt looks to be a contradiction of national policy's intention to protect the green belt, as removal of this land from the green belt would enclose adjoining green belt and so could create an argument for further adjoining land to later be removed from the green belt, creating an urban sprawl and loss of more or all green belt separation.</p> <p>With specific reference to Tanner barn</p> <p>1. The landscape assessment incorrectly names Tanner barn as Tanner Farm on several occasions.</p> <p>2. The assessment then proceeds to suggest that Tanner barn is a hamlet and could be re-developed into a small housing development. Tanner barn is a farm and two attached cottages: Cowhouse Cottage and Shippon Cottage with door numbering being 1; 2 and 3 Tanner barn all situated in the village of Acre.</p> <p>3. Tanner barn marks the north east corner of the boundary of the village and its fields provide some of the vital green belt separation between Acre and the Hamlet of Sherfin. Documents held at National archives dated 1593 reveal that in its previous incarnation's (Taller barn/Taylor barn) this barn has marked the old township boundary for centuries and so is of significant historic value to the local area.</p> <p>4. Whilst there is a strong objection to this historic property being removed from the village, demolished or turned into any sort of new development; a heritage sensitive restoration of this</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p data-bbox="1442 148 2168 236">farmhouse and 2 cottages that recognises the history of Tanner barn and the fact that it is a boundary marker of the village of Acre would be most welcomed.</p> <p data-bbox="1442 277 2159 400">With specific reference to Acre/Hazel Mill (n.b. this mill was built as Acre Mill and though a later owner changed the name to Hazel Mill, the name Acre Mill has stuck and is still used by locals)</p> <ol data-bbox="1442 408 2163 1080" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1442 408 2163 531">1. A heritage sensitive redevelopment in stone with slate roof of the demolished part of Acre mill that incorporates the original mill façade with its pediment containing the co-operative beehive would be welcomed. <li data-bbox="1442 568 2163 754">2. It is to be noted that the mill lodge is located next to this site and though it was in recent years part filled in, this lodge is still supplied with water from the stream which then runs through a culvert along the back lane. A scheme to turn this mill lodge into a wildlife area with seating and picnic area that the villagers could enjoy would be most welcomed. <li data-bbox="1442 799 2163 1080">3. The village suffers from an ongoing problem of speeding both on the A680 Blackburn Road Acre and at the grade junction at the Rising Bridge Roundabout where the northerly section of the A56 Acre runs directly across the pavement with no safe means for pedestrians to cross. As any development in the village will only serve to increase traffic and associated problems we would welcome appropriate car parking, traffic calming measures and safe means of crossing the A680 and A56 as part of any development.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
37	Resident	GB	Winfield, Haslingden		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Village of Acre</p> <p>Acre is a Victorian village that incorporates 6 earlier farm estates and looks to be unique in Rossendale as it was built by one woman - Miss Margaret Piling. She built the village to house mill workers from Acre Mill, a co-operative cotton mill that was built at the same time on land Miss Piling also owned. The village has seen very little alteration since construction during the 1860's and 70's so remain an interesting case study of a very small 'model' village. The greenbelt around this village serves to protect the character of this Victorian mill village by preventing unnecessary development, preventing urban spall and maintaining greenbelt separation between the neighbouring town of Haslingden, the village of Rising Bridge and the hamlet of Sherfin.</p> <p>1. As explained above Acre is significant in that it is a small model Victorian mill village built by a single person. The heritage value is possibly only highlighted by the fact that the person who built this village was a woman and the mill a co-operative. Unlike conservation areas such as Irwell Vale that have seen much development over the years, Acre has been handed down with next to no development since its inception. The land assessment appears to have completely ignored both these facts and national policy; instead putting forward a proposal that would completely destroys the character, heritage value and setting of this village.</p> <p>2. The very essence of the green belt is its permanence and the Government attaches great importance to green belts. This importance is demonstrated by how the Government has now spelt out that unmet housing need is NOT an exceptional circumstance. Any development in the village's green belt would go against government ruling as it would lead to areas of a rural/countryside nature being unnecessarily included in the built up area.</p> <p>3. Current Planning practice guidance says that; the essential characteristics of green belts are their openness and their permanence. The current proposal would encroach into the remaining green belt separation between the village of Acre and the village of Rising Bridge and hamlet of Sherfin reducing the current distance between settlements and so erode or remove the green belt separation.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>4. Rather than serving to protect the green belt, the proposal looks to aim to create urban sprawl, actively encourages encroachment into the green belt and destroys most of the green belt separation between the village of Acre and the village of Rising Bridge and hamlet of Sherfin.</p> <p>5. National planning policy states that even in exceptional circumstances, development must be small scale and not damage the overall character of an area or increase the built up area of town, village or hamlet by more than 5%. Despite the Government having spelt out that unmet housing need is NOT an exceptional circumstance, these proposals appear to completely ignore national policy and suggest a development that looks to be over 200% of existing settlement.</p> <p>6. To the distress of villagers recent years have seen an erosion of Acre's identity with the village being mis-addressed as Haslingden or Rising Bridge. As a result villagers have spent the last few years campaigning to halt and reverse this erosion. 'Welcome to Acre' signposts have been erected and the Royal Mail have reinstated the correct address for the village by including the village as a locality in their postcode address file. The result being that since October 2013 the official postal address has matched the location address which is: Acre, Rossendale, and Lancashire. Distressingly this assessment appears to have completely ignored the villager's efforts, the correct address and the very existence of this village instead choosing to misleadingly calling the village Haslingden. The proposals then proceeded to compound the issue as whilst they completely ignore the existence of a whole village (Acre) they have chosen to recognise and refer to the neighbouring village of Rising Bridge and the hamlet of Sherfin. It is of note that since its inception Acre has consistently been viewed as a village by Ordnance Survey and is recorded on all of its maps accordingly. As a result it would be impossible to look at an OS map or the postal address file and not be aware of the village's existence.</p> <p>7. Further offence and inaccuracy has been caused by the site being addressed as 'the Winfields site Haslingden'. The site is not in Haslingden, nor is the entire proposed site as marked on the</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>assessments plans owned by Dale Winfield owner of the Winfield mill store which is based in the former Acre Mill (currently addressed as: Hazel Mill, ormerod Street, Acre, Rossendale, Lancashire).</p> <p>8. Removing land from the green belt and development of this green belt land would adversely impact upon local and longer distance views. It would also detrimentally affect the openness of the Green belt as the proposed area juts out into the green belt and any development could be viewed from many places in and around the village and surrounding settlements.</p> <p>9. Removing this land from the green belt looks to be a contradiction of national policy's intention to protect the green belt, as removal of this land from the green belt would enclose adjoining green belt and so could create an argument for further adjoining land to later be removed from the green belt, creating an urban sprawl and loss of more or all green belt separation.</p> <p>With specific reference to Tanner barn</p> <p>1. The landscape assessment incorrectly names Tanner barn as Tanner Farm on several occasions.</p> <p>2. The assessment then proceeds to suggest that Tanner barn is a hamlet and could be re-developed into a small housing development. Tanner barn is a farm and two attached cottages: Cowhouse Cottage and Shippon Cottage with door numbering being 1; 2 and 3 Tanner barn all situated in the village of Acre.</p> <p>3. Tanner barn marks the north east corner of the boundary of the village and its fields provide some of the vital green belt separation between Acre and the Hamlet of Sherfin. Documents held at National archives dated 1593 reveal that in its previous incarnation's (Taller barn/Taylor barn) this barn has marked the old township boundary for centuries and so is of significant historic value to the local area.</p> <p>4. Whilst there is a strong objection to this historic property being removed from the village, demolished or turned into any sort of new development; a heritage sensitive restoration of this</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p data-bbox="1442 148 2168 236">farmhouse and 2 cottages that recognises the history of Tanner barn and the fact that it is a boundary marker of the village of Acre would be most welcomed.</p> <p data-bbox="1442 277 2159 400">With specific reference to Acre/Hazel Mill (n.b. this mill was built as Acre Mill and though a later owner changed the name to Hazel Mill, the name Acre Mill has stuck and is still used by locals)</p> <ol data-bbox="1442 408 2159 1082" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1442 408 2159 531">1. A heritage sensitive redevelopment in stone with slate roof of the demolished part of Acre mill that incorporates the original mill façade with its pediment containing the co-operative beehive would be welcomed. <li data-bbox="1442 568 2159 754">2. It is to be noted that the mill lodge is located next to this site and though it was in recent years part filled in, this lodge is still supplied with water from the stream which then runs through a culvert along the back lane. A scheme to turn this mill lodge into a wildlife area with seating and picnic area that the villagers could enjoy would be most welcomed. <li data-bbox="1442 791 2159 1082">3. The village suffers from an ongoing problem of speeding both on the A680 Blackburn Road Acre and at the grade junction at the Rising Bridge Roundabout where the northerly section of the A56 Acre runs directly across the pavement with no safe means for pedestrians to cross. As any development in the village will only serve to increase traffic and associated problems we would welcome appropriate car parking, traffic calming measures and safe means of crossing the A680 and A56 as part of any development.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
38	Resident	GB	Land at Winfields, Ormerod Street, Acre,	HRB(GB)207	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. Acre is a Victorian village that incorporates 6 earlier farm estates and looks to be unique in Rossendale as it was built by one woman - Miss Margaret Piling. She built the village to house mill workers from Acre Mill, a co-operative cotton mill that was built at the same time on land Miss Piling also owned. The village has seen very little alteration since construction during the 1860's and 70's so remain an interesting case study of a very small 'model' village. The greenbelt around this village serves to protect the character of this Victorian mill village by preventing unnecessary development, preventing urban spall and maintaining greenbelt separation between the neighbouring town of Haslingden, the village of Rising Bridge and the hamlet of Sherfin.</p> <p>2. The very essence of the greenbelt is its permence and the Government attaches great importance to greenbelts. This importance is demonstrated by how the Government has now (Monday 6 October 2014) spelt out that unmet housing need is NOT an exceptional circumstance. HRB(GB)05 Land at Winfields, Acre has not been identified as required for housing needs nor are there any 'exceptional circumstances' that would permit it to be acceptable or even necessary for it removed from the green belt. Any change to the boundary here would lead to areas or a rural/countryside nature being unnecessarily included in the built up area.</p> <p>3. Current Planning practice guidance says that; the essential characteristics of green belts are their openness and their permanence. The current proposal would encroach into the remaining green belt separation between the village of Acre and the village of Rising Bridge and Hamlet of Sherfin reducing the current distance between settlements and so erode the greenbelt separation.</p> <p>4. The site does not look to be hard standing and instead looks to be bark chippings on the earth of the green belt.</p> <p>5. It is of concern that the landowner has been permitted to encroach onto the green belt in a way that has lead to this proposal to remove some of his land and place it in the urban boundary. Rather than serving to protect the green belt, the</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>proposal HRB(GB)05 Land at Winfields, Acre looks to be regarding these actions and actively encouraging further encroachment into the green belt by Winfield's mill store.</p> <p>6. This area is on the edge of the urban area rather than encompassed by it. For land to be removed from the green belt due to reading as urban, the proposed land would need to be predominantly encompassed by built up from i.e. surrounded on 3 sides by built up area which this proposed land is not. Quite the opposite the land is surrounded by green belt on 3 sides and so reads as green belt and guidelines say must not be removed from the green belt.</p> <p>7. Removing this land from the green belt could encourage development of the land and so adversely impact upon local and longer distance views or detrimentally affect the openness of the Green Belt as it juts out into the green belt.</p> <p>8. Removing this land from the green belt looks to be a contradiction of national policy's intention to protect the green belt, as its removal from the green belt would enclose adjoining green belt and so could create an argument for further adjoining land to later be removed from the green belt, creating urban sprawl and loss of more green belt separation.</p> <p>Diagrams to demonstrate these arguments are on the following page.</p> <p>1. The broken blue line shows how it is proposed to remove a section of the green belt into the urban boundary. It also demonstrates how the plot shares only a very short boundary on one side with the urban boundary and that the majority of this land is bordered by green belt. Guidelines reveal that land that is bordered on 3 sides by green belt remain in the green belt.</p> <p>2. Proposals would see the loss of openness of the green belt and local and longer distance views affected as urban boundary would jut out into the green belt. Further erosion of the green belt could then happen as the adjacent section of green belt would no longer be open and would instead be enclosed on two sides. This</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									<p>action would encourage the argument that the adjacent green belt land now reads as urban and so should also be removed from the green belt.</p> <p>3. This diagram demonstrates the potential long term effect of the current proposal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Erosion and loss of green belt; - Loss of local and longer distance views; - Erosion of the green belt separation between Acre, Rising Bridge and Sherfin; - Encouragement of unnecessary development on the green belt
39	Resident	GB	Land at Winfields, Acre	HRB(GB)207	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This area is NOT built up. It has a gravel/bark mulch surface and a fence so would be easy to change back to a green/grassed open field. Also it "sticks out" from the urban boundary into the Green Belt so does not seem defensible to me. Surely including this area in the urban boundary would lead to Winfields requesting extra land to be within the urban boundary. It would also lead to the boundary of Acre being brought much closer to Rising Bridge reducing the gap between settlements.</p>
2	Resident	GB	South of St Marys RC School, Moorlandris	HRB(GB)106	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Boundary clearly identified now, no need for change. Two small parcels of land hardly relevant in the greater scale of things. I cannot believe we are spending time, money and energy on this subject. The Green Belt is clearly identified by a five foot metal fence, surprisingly the Green Belt is green in colour!</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
73	Resident	GB	Land to south of St Mary's RC School Mo	HRB(GB)106	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Boundary Reference HRB9GB007 Land to south of St Mary's RC School Moorland Rise</p> <p>We object to the proposals to move the Green Belt Boundary for the following reasons; criteria ref 2d and 3e We feel that our views and openness would be affected if the boundary was to be changed from Green Belt to Urban. When we purchased our property it was with the knowledge that it bordered directly onto green belt. If this were to be changed and the area built on any this would not only obstruct the open nature of the site but due to the sloping nature of the site any building would be facing directly into our bedroom windows! Any building would also cause problems with access again due to the sloping nature of the site and affect drainage which is already an issue. We would therefore greatly appreciate that the green belt boundary should be maintained in order to protect the views and openness of the Green Belt. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.</p>
11	Resident	GB	Haslingden Road, From Rawtenstall Centr	HRB(GB)109	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>To allow development only if sympathetic with surrounding area. Not to overcrowd anyone anywhere. To allow development anywhere that it can be proven that development WILL compliment surroundings area and NOT have either nuisance or blight on other sections.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
55	Resident	GB	Green belt to north of longshoot/ Kirkhill	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>I am enquiring as to what is the council policy for green belt land? The land in question is green belt and creates a small barrier between existing houses on Moorland Rise and Haslingden Old Road, any development would spoil the countryside which is rapidly going to developers. The green belt boundary has already moved to allow the development of the houses on Moorland Rise, and if any development was authorized now there would be no green belt between houses and Haslingden Old Road. This would also break into the sky line. When looking down from Haslingden Old Road. There surely must be many suitable brown field sites within the urban boundary that the Council could utilize, rather than building on this land.</p> <p>Should the green belt be developed, access road(s) would have to be created, Halsingden Old Road already carries much traffic and is used as a 'rabbit run' between Haslingden and Rawtenstall. There are overhead pylons on this land which would need rerouting and the land also carries a severe slope. My farm buildings are adjacent to this land I have grazed my cattle and cultivated this land for more than 20 years, I would lose this facility. Should the green belt be developed, because of the severe slope, the land would have to be excavated extensively to create foundations and a level building plot. I am extremely concerned about this, as it could cause severe land movement in/around my farm buildings. Who will be responsible for ensuring my buildings remain stable now and in the future?</p> <p>Also underneath the land, drains have been laid, in order to deal with storm water running from the surrounding hillside, onto Haslingden Old Road, and down towards the existing houses on Moorland Rise. If this land was developed, the storm water would now be land based and would need extensive drainage in order to protect new and existing houses from flooding.</p> <p>My property is not connected to the mains water supply, I rely solely for my domestic water supply through a bore hold and underground springs. I am extremely concerned about the water table being severely affected or contaminated by any development. I also understand that you have had an independent body submit a comprehensive report to the Council which clearly states that this land is not suitable for housing development? Over 50 years ago the Council supplied and positioned a bench on Halsingden Old Road adjacent to my property. Many local</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									<p>residents and visitors to the area take the opportunity to sit and enjoy the panoramic view of the valley from this bench. Daily, I get comments from local people and visitors, some who have travelled long distances to visit the Halo, who stop and take photographs of the valley from the bench.</p> <p>To lose this natural viewpoint through development is surely wrong. The view from Haslingden Old Road into the valley has been enjoyed by many people over the years, and to develop this green belt land in order to build houses will mean it will be lost forever. Green Belt land is for the enjoyment of everyone and should not be encroached upon for the development of houses.</p>
12	Resident	GB	North of Yarmouth Avenue	HRB(GB)107	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Much of this land is already in the Green Belt and considering it for development would be to bring the urban boundaries of Rawtenstall and Haslingden too close together. It would negatively impact the Green Belt and the views of this area.
16	Resident	GB	Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SHLAA Site ID 17 and 18: 2a) This area is seen as a separation zone between Haslingden and Rawtenstall. Removing the Green belt and developing it would link the two towns. 2d) Developing this land would ruin the long and local views of the approach to the valley from the main bypass. 2f) This area does make a significant contribution.
124	Partner	GB	Land at Winfields, Acre	HRB(GB)207	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	We have various pieces of water and wastewater infrastructure that pass through and in the vicinity of this site. Therefore if development is intended to take place in this location, we need to be consulted at an early stage to ensure our infrastructure is not compromised. Please note there also appears to be a culverted watercourse, which passes through the site. In accordance with the surface water hierarchy, this represents an option for surface water discharge, at an agreed attenuated rate, which is preferable to the public sewer. We would ask any future developer(s) to contact us to explore options for addressing this as early as possible.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
57	Resident	GB	Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Ris	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Whilst noting that it is stated "that removal from Green Belt does not necessarily mean that the land will be allocated or is suitable for development" then if that is not the future intention, that begs the question "why spend time and money to take it out of the green belt"?</p> <p>Removal of the green belt with the subsequent development will definitely adversely impact on the views from not only ours but adjacent properties by severely breaking the skyline. Development of the South Western half of the site will have a detrimental effect upon the openness and informal recreational use of children playing and locals exercising their dogs, which may of course lead to further footpath fouling.</p> <p>And whilst acknowledging that this may not be directly relating to the boundary change, access to Site B from Moorland Rise as indicated on the Development framework Plan shown on page 25 will be very steep from an un-adopted road [Moorland Rise] [as are all the accesses to Sites A & B] I consider this would give rise to carriage way drainage problems and frozen patches during winter conditions and must be taken into account in considering taking the site out of the green belt, in fact consider that is why it should be in the green belt so that safety is not compromised as there are significant constraints that would prevent its early development i.e. access.</p> <p>Alternative access off Haslingden Old Road would be dangerous due to site lines and traffic speed, which begs the question "why take it out of the green belt?"</p> <p>I consider that this proposal does NOT make any beneficial use of the green belt and will only give rise to future problems.</p> <p>Irrespective of whether or not this is taken into account the consultation document in section 3 "Consideration in SHLAA" clause 3.6 states that a hospital is within 5km of the site, Rossendale hospital is demolished and now a building site: I can only surmise this is a reference to the "Hub" in Rawtenstall, which I believe not to be a hospital, both Blackburn and Burnley hospitals are much further away.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
13	Resident	GB	Green Belt to north of Longshoot/Kirkhill	HRB(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Much of this land is already in the Green Belt and considering it for development would be to bring the urban boundaries of Rawtenstall and Haslingden too close together. It would negatively impact the Green Belt and the views of this area. The area HRB(GB)201 between Haslingden Old Road and Moorland Rise/Kirkhill Avenue is currently open and has a nice 'farmland' feel to it. Developing this with new housing I feel would detract from the feel of the area and make the road feel to enclosed.
116	Developer	GB	Land at Kirkhill Avenue & Moorland Rise	HRB(GB)201	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
			AREA	Rawtenstall					
45	Resident	GB	Land at Haslam farm, Townsend Fold	RCGL(GB)203	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If this land is re-designated as being suitable for urban development it would open the doors for the developers, who if they got planning would fill the area with buildings, which in turn would rob us of the views both distant and near to! These lovely open spaces are the lungs of Townsend Fold. My daughter's house overlooks this area, and visitor to her home are immediately thunder struck with admiration for the wonderful view from her window. Anything impeding this vista would be closing the gateway to Rawtenstall to visitors coming in on the East Lancashire steam trains as well as stealing our children's heritage. I implore you to keep this small finger of land as Green Belt. Yours Sincerely,
46	Resident	GB	Land at Haslam farm, Townsend Fold	RCGL(GB)203	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I strongly feel that removing this site from the Green Belt would have a major detrimental disruption of near and distant views across the gateway to Rawtenstall,eEspecially when approaching on the East Lancashire railway. There are still plenty of brownfield sites and empty properties in Rossendale without removing the natural beauty the Green Belt offers. "Please save our valley green lungs"
133	Resident	UB		RCGL(UB)10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	See hyperlink for details

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
75	Resident	GB	Haslam Farm	RCGL(GB)203	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Below are our objections to the proposed green belt boundary change at Haslam Farm, reference RCGL(GB) 203.</p> <p>A development framework document produced by Turley Associates for Peel Land & Property suggested changes to the green belt in order to allow for the land at Haslam Farm to be developed into housing. Subsequent amendments have seen the size of the proposed development drastically reduced and so the whole case, argument and economic benefits proposed in the document are now unrealistic, inaccurate and no longer reflect the reduced proposed boundary changes.</p> <p>The land currently still in scope for removal from the green belt acts as a green buffer space separating the industrial area to west of the site from the housing to the east. Removing the proposed site from the green belt will significantly reduce the distance between the industrial and housing areas.</p> <p>The site is currently used by all manner of wildlife. Bats cross the field for feeding, badgers, Canadian geese and foxes are all regular users of the site to name a few.</p> <p>Local and longer distance views will be impacted by the use of this land for housing, views from the East Lancashire Railway will be drastically changed, views from current housing on Bury Road will be further impacted because views of the railway line will be lost and other views from across the valley will be damaged.</p> <p>The long, narrow and sloped shape of the proposed site presents its own challenges for building, the Lives and Landscape Assessment for Rossendale BC document produced by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects suggests that the project could be acceptable with landscaping mitigation including screening using moderately high planting to the east boundary, unfortunately I doubt consideration has been given to the main sewer pipe works that run down the east boundary. Planting or landscaping over the top of such utility pipe work would normally be considered bad practice because root systems from planting can cause pipe work damage and landscaping complicates remedial works.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									<p>High planting would also be a concern for the current housing on Bury Road and this would also restrict views and prevent light from entering the properties. Root systems associated with planting could also undermine and cause structural damage to the existing boundary walls.</p> <p>Due to all these potential challenges and the need to keep any new houses significantly far enough away from current housing so as to maintain privacy and not impact light levels, the amount of land actually available for building on becomes constrained on an already long, narrow and sloping site.</p> <p>Given the criteria under which land will only be considered for removal from the green belt then I believe that the land at Haslam Farm should remain within the green belt.</p>
130	Developer	GB	Land to rear of Lower Cribden Avenue	RCGL(GB)101	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	See hyperlink for details
15	Resident	GB	Land at Union Road	RCGL(GB)205	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Much of this land is already in the Green Belt and considering it for development would be to bring the urban boundaries of Rawtenstall and Haslingden too close together. It would negatively impact the Green Belt and the views of this area.
132	Resident	UB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
129	Developer	GB	Land at Union Road	RCGL(GB)205	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	See hyperlink for details
14	Resident	GB	Land at Pike Hill	RCGL(GB)204	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Much of this land is already in the Green Belt and considering it for development would be to bring the urban boundaries of Rawtenstall and Haslingden too close together. It would negatively impact the Green Belt and the views of this area.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
72	Resident	GB	Haslam Farm	RCGL(GB)203	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Reasons for objecting to the proposed changes of the green belt boundary at Haslam Farm are as follows:-</p> <p>Currently the site provides a buffer between the residential houses on Bury Road and the industrial units of K-Steels.</p> <p>As stated in the Lives and Landscapes document the site offers much diversity and interest to the Railway users, this also applies to the current residents on Bury Road. As do the views of the railway itself. I believe the East Lancashire railway has objected to the proposed development stating that it would be detrimental to the views their passengers get coming into Rawtenstall. What should not be overlooked is that the railway also brings consumer spending into the town as passengers visit the various shops and businesses.</p> <p>There is also a wide variety of wildlife use the site from bats to badgers, foxes to wild geese.</p> <p>If the views for the railway users of the proposed development are to be presented as attractive by using house frontages or open spaces then what will the views be for the residents on Bury Road surely this is as important.</p> <p>The proposed planting of trees, to reduce the impact of the development, could potentially undermine the boundary walls of the current properties and have a major impact on the sewers that run through the field.</p>
131	Resident	UB	Urban Boundary around Reeds House	RCGL(UB)10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	See hyperlink for details

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
112	Developer	GB	Land to the west of Riverside Business Pa	ADD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The site comprises greenfield land to the immediate west of the existing employment site at Riverside Business Park, off Holme Lane in Rawtenstall.</p> <p>An indicative plan to show the area proposed to be removed from green belt is enclosed with this submission.</p> <p>The site is within a single ownership.</p> <p>Please refer to covering letter which sets out the reasons why the land should be considered for removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Covering letter: Dear Sir/Madam Re-Consultation on Green Belt - Representation in relation to land at Riverside Business Park, Holme Lane, Rawtenstall</p> <p>Please find enclosed a completed form on behalf of my client B&E Boys Limited submitted in relation to the current Re-Consultation on the Green Belt boundary in Rossendale Borough. I have also enclosed a plan that indicates the area of land proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. The site comprises land to the west of Riverside Business Park which is an existing employment site located on Holme Lane in Rawtenstall.</p> <p>It is considered that the area edged in red should be considered suitable for removal from the Green belt as it would accord with the criteria for Green Belt changes. Namely:</p> <p>a) The removal of the land would not significantly reduce the current distance between settlements and built up areas separated by Green Belt.</p> <p>B) The site perimeter is directly adjacent to the Urban Boundary which runs along the River Irwell.</p> <p>C) It would not hinder urban regeneration of derelict, vacant and/or previously-developed land in adjacent or neighbouring settlements. The site is located immediately adjacent to an existing employment site.</p> <p>D) It would not adversely impact upon local and longer distance views or detrimentally affect the openness of the Green Belt. The</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									<p>site is sandwiched between a backdrop of existing buildings which are in active employment use (at Riverside Business Park), and the A56 main road.</p> <p>E) It would not be detrimental to the setting and/or special character of historic towns and settlements.</p> <p>F) It does not make a significant contribution to the beneficial use of the Green Belt.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss these submissions with the local planning authority in the New Year so that we can explain the reasoning for the proposed removal of the land in greater detail.</p> <p>In our opinion, the removal of this land from the Green belt would not harm the fundamental aim of Green belt policy and it should not be included as it is unnecessary to keep the land permanently open.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving confirmation that this Representation has been received as part of the Re-Consultation on Green Belt.</p> <p>We will be in touch in the New Year with a review to arranging a meeting so that we can discuss the site in more detail.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>
24	Resident	GB	Land off Union Road	RCGL(GB)205	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The land off Union Road should remain as green belt to ensure adequate separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall. If developed this plot would create significant visual impact particularly viewed from the east of the Valley.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
134			Urban boundary around Reeds House	RCGL(UB)10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The purpose of this letter is to register my objection to RCGL (UB) 10 Proposed Boundary Change.</p> <p>I was first made aware of the proposed boundary change during a chance conversation with Richard Elliott (Planning Officer at RBC) when I was in the process of purchasing my house on Short Clough Close. I followed this up with a phone call to Adrian Smith, who confirmed that the first stage consultation on the proposed boundary change had passed unopposed, and it was now proceeding to the second stage consultation, due in Summer 2015. When I discussed this with my soon-to-be neighbours, it was clear that none of them (without exception) were aware of this proposed boundary change, or had been consulted in any manner by RBC with regard to the proposed boundary change.</p> <p>Whilst it may not be crystal clear as to what does or does not constitute “consultation” with regard to the boundary change proposed by RBC, I think it is generally accepted that a consultation must, at the very least, inform those affected and allow them to express their views. Otherwise, a consultation it cannot be! On that basis, I would challenge that a valid first stage consultation ever took place with regard to RCGL (UB) 10 Proposed Boundary Change.</p> <p>As far as I understand, RBC used the document “Criteria for Urban Boundary Changes” (“CUBC”) and the “Urban Boundary Assessment Criteria” (“UBAC”) as the basis and reasoning for proposing the boundary change.</p> <p>Looking at the CUBC and UBAC, I would feedback as follows:</p> <p>CRITERIA 1</p> <p>1a Boundaries are inaccurately drawn, or</p> <p>1b Do not follow strong, robust and permanent boundaries on the ground, or</p> <p>1c Areas of land no longer read as part of the wider built up area, or</p> <p>1d Areas of land clearly read as part of the wider built up area.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>Boundaries are accurately drawn. The current boundary is a clear, strong, robust, on the ground boundary, running along the back of the “urban” housing estate, known as Reedsholme. Indeed, this current boundary continues along the back of the urban housing estate, in a southerly direction, for around a mile, through to the Constable Lee estate.</p> <p>The current boundary is permanent and is clearly and physically marked out, in full, by wooden or wire fences.</p> <p>The UBAC, as completed by RBC, indicates that minor changes to the boundary are proposed around Reeds Farm, yet the accompanying map does not show Reeds Farm? Can you please clarify the location of Reeds Farm?</p> <p>No changes to the boundary are required around Reeds Barn or Reeds House, as these do not form part of the built up area. Reeds House and Reeds Barn are farmhouses and associated outbuildings. They are far removed from the urban estate and can each only be accessed by a single track private lane. Reeds House and Reeds Barn do not form part of the built up area; they clearly form part of the countryside, and that is distinctly evident by looking at the map.</p> <p>As a further point, if RBC are proposing a boundary change based on Reeds House and Reeds Barn (as stated in UBAC, 1d), why is the land around Short Clough Farm and the “middle field” also included in the boundary change proposal? Is this a mistake, as there is no basis for this proposed boundary change in the UBAC? This land, essentially a stand-alone farm house very far removed from any urban development, and a farmer’s field which is used for cattle grazing, is very clearly not urban, is not accessed via the urban estate but is accessed only by a private single track road from Crawshawbooth, and is very clearly part of the countryside.</p> <p>The boundary change proposed by RBC uses Reeds Farm as its justification in UBAC 1a and UBAC 1b, yet Reeds Farm is not shown on the included map? UBAC 1c is not applicable and UBAC 1d refers only to Reeds Barn and Reeds House – thereby giving no justification as to why Short Clough Farm or the “middle field”</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>would be included in the proposed boundary change.</p> <p>My view is that there is no valid basis for RCGL (UB) 10 Proposed Boundary Change, and the proposal should therefore be withdrawn.</p> <p>CRITERIA 2</p> <p>2a is capable of being developed sustainably and integrated into the existing built-up area</p> <p>The UBAC, as completed by RBC, indicates the possibility of a small number of dwellings being built between Reeds House and Short Clough Farm.</p> <p>To be absolutely clear, this land is NOT capable of being developed sustainably and integrated into the existing built-up area. The land is very steep, very boggy and much waterlogged. The land houses many well established trees, which I understand are subject to tree protection orders, and many natural water springs. The only access to the land is via single track private lanes, neither of which, for geographical reasons, could be turned into two-way roads.</p> <p>There is no access to sewerage, water or gas, with very limited access to electricity. All such services would have to be accessed from a substantial distance.</p> <p>2b would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment unless it is capable of full mitigation</p> <p>The UBAC states “No significant natural environment issues.” This is completely incorrect.</p> <p>In terms of the natural ANIMAL environment, I have only lived here a short time, but in that time, I have observed the following in the “middle field”; deer, sheep, rabbits, squirrels, and many species of bird – the most striking being the Herons, who spend a huge amount of their time in the field. There would clearly be a HUGE impact on the natural animal environment if the urban boundary</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>was changed, and the land became available for future development.</p> <p>In terms of the natural LAND environment, the countryside land which is being proposed to be moved within the urban boundary is very steep, and unfortunately for myself and other local residents, is very boggy, marshy and water-logged. The extent of this has been even more evident with the recent bad weather, and in fact, is a matter which now needs to be addressed in its own right. The countryside land in question also houses a number (possibly 12, 13 or 14) of well-established trees, which provide a degree of stability to the steep land, protection to the nearby houses and a habitat for the local wildlife. As I understand, these trees are quite rightly subject to a protection order, which would make any future development of the land very difficult. In addition, the land has a number of natural water springs, which would, again, make any future development almost impossible.</p> <p>2c) would not result in the amalgamation of settlements or adversely affect the character of the settlement</p> <p>It absolutely WOULD result in the amalgamation of settlements; it would be impossible to argue against this point.</p> <p>2d) would not adversely affect heritage assets of their settling</p> <p>I have no relevant information on this point as yet.</p> <p>2e) is capable of being developed without a significant adverse impact on local views and viewpoints, including where appropriate, the use of appropriate mitigation measures</p> <p>The land could NOT be developed without significant adverse impact on local views and viewpoints. The land is a very steep field which can be seen from many different directions, at a distance. For the residents of Short Clough Close, Rushbed Drive and Hall Close – all of whom have direct views onto the countryside land, there would be a significant adverse impact. In addition, all the local residents who see the countryside land as they are driving in</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									<p>the local area would also be adversely impacted.</p> <p>My view is that the land subject to the proposed boundary change could not be developed sustainably or be integrated into the existing built-up area. In addition, any future development would absolutely affect aspects of the natural environment and have a significant adverse impact on local views and viewpoints.</p> <p>CRITERIA 3</p> <p>Open land on the edge of existing settlements will be excluded from the Urban Boundary where it has existing recreational or community value to ensure it remains undeveloped</p> <p>There is no existing recreational or community value, as defined in the UBCA.</p> <p>As a summary, I would question whether a valid first stage "consultation" was ever carried out with regard to RCGL (UB) 10 Proposed Boundary Change.</p> <p>If it is determined that a valid first stage consultation was carried out with regard to RCGL (UB) 10 Proposed Boundary Change, I would then question whether there is any valid basis, using CUBC and UBAC, for RCGL (UB) 10 Proposed Boundary Change.</p> <p>If it is determined that there is a valid basis for RCGL (UB) 10 Proposed Boundary Change, I would then question the validity of the scope of RCGL (UB) 10 Proposed Boundary Change.</p> <p>If it is determined that the scope of RCGL (UB) 10 Proposed Boundary Change is valid, my objections are stated herein.</p>
22	Resident	Othe	Playing Pitch behind Bacup Road Rawtens		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There's no playing area in Rawtenstall. I would prefer to have this as a playing area as a request
108	Resident	GB	Townsend Fold West of Bury Road, South	RCGL(GB)203	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	How green was our valley. Not contributing to local character.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
20	Resident	GB	Land behind K Steels	RCGL(GB)202	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please refer to our detailed submission already made to Forward Planning. It is noted that the original proposals have been modified to exclude RCGL(GB)202 and Duckworth Lane is proposed as the boundary line for the change in RCGL(GB)203 which does make better sense. The residents would prefer no change to the boundary as the area is a gateway into Rossendale and used by walkers, residents etc. We strongly support the new recommendation to leave area B and C in the Green Belt and the land behind K Steels.
98	Resident	UB			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Our objections relate to the loss of this green space in particular but within the Rossendale Valley generally where in recent years it is clear that the majority of new housing development has been on this type of land. Evidence from across the country clearly indicates that difficult urban/brown field sites are ignored by developers who are happy to wait for easier green field sites to be made available and phased in, thereby reducing the likelihood of the redevelopment of the former leading to an inevitable increase of the urban footprint.</p> <p>Reedsholme estate has expanded dramatically over the past 20 years and the volume of traffic increased with it. We feel strongly that any further change will only exasperate traffic problems at peak times both on the estate and the nearby Burnley Road.</p> <p>Access to this land (UB)10 is very poor currently via Shortclough Lane and Reeds Lane which being unadopted single track lanes would be totally unsuitable.</p> <p>At the rear of our property, number 9 two houses were built without proper access which has caused many problems for Rushbed Drive residents i.e. delivery vans unable to access the narrow lane, removal vans having to park at the top and carry all furniture on foot, residents parking outside our home in bad weather making it difficult to drive out of our own driveway.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
123	Partner	GB	Haslam Farm	RCGL(GB)203	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	United Utilities has various pieces of water and wastewater infrastructure passing through this site including significant water infrastructure with associated easement. All UU assets will need to be afforded due regard in the masterplanning process. We would ask any future developer(s) to contact us to explore options for addressing this as early as possible. Plans of our assets are available from Property Searches (Tel No: 08707 510 101)
89	Resident	GB	Land at Haslam Farm Bury Road Rawtenst	RCGL(GB)203	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>We both attended the consultation at Rawtenstall Library on 24 November 2014. A map was displayed on which a blue line was marked following the route of Duckworth Lane down from Bury Road. It was explained to us that this line represented the Council's proposal for the revised boundary of the Green Belt and that the Haslam Farm land immediately to the south of it would, under the proposals, remain in the Green Belt. WE CERTAINLY HOPE THAT THIS IS THE CASE.</p> <p>It was further explained to us that the triangle of land immediately to the south of K Steels (between the East Lancashire Railway and the river) was wrongly shown on the map as likely to lose its Green Belt status. WE ASSUME THAT THIS ERROR WILL BE CORRECTED ON ANY FUTURE MAPS PLACED BEFORE COUNCIL PRIOR TO ANY FINAL DECISIONS BEING TAKEN.</p> <p>Please note that the map displayed at the Rawtenstall Library consultation was also reproduced in miniature in the Council's trifold leaflet, a leaflet made widely available to the public.</p>
117	Developer	GB	Land at Haslam Farm, off Bury Road	RCGL(GB)203	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
21	Resident	GB	Land at Haslam Farm	RCGL(GB)203	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please refer to our detailed submission already made to Forward Planning. It is noted that the original proposals have been modified to exclude RCGL(GB)202 and Duckworth Lane is proposed as the boundary line for the change in RCGL(GB)203 which does make better sense. The residents would prefer no change to the boundary as the area is a gateway into Rossendale and used by walkers, residents etc. We strongly support the new recommendation to leave area B and C in the Green Belt and the land behind K Steels.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
AREA		South West							
52	Resident	GB		SW(GB)201	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The re-consultation process has been rushed and poorly presented. The information given is confusing both on-line and at the calendar event in Edenfield. There was no register of visitors to sign on arrival (although I believe one was produced late) to judge the response number. The map on show was indistinct and provided very little info, which had to be looked up in 2 large lever arch files on an individual basis. All this info should have been put up on the walls in a clear form for people to read and discuss. A very amateurial effort.</p> <p>The whole process of reconsidering the GB around Edenfield has been affected by Peel Holdings presenting their plans for houses/roads etc at every site, even those not being considered. Does this mean that a taint approval has already been given by RBC? I am concerned that ANY development would greatly affect the character and ambience at the village and I am wholly opposed to the plan.</p> <p>The notice of the meeting in Edenfield arrived here on Nov 14 and the meeting was called on the 19th. Not enough notice. The consultation ends on the 23rd Dec again a rushed review and suggests it was arranged to thawrt the local residents from expressing their views. The EVRA does not meet in December, the weather and Christmas preparations seriously limit the time available to bring people together to express a unified view and any semblance of a democratic consultation has been ignored. The deadline of the 23rd December should be extended by 2 months to the end of February 2015 to allow a sufficient time for a full and open re-consultation review to be carried out by the residents.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
51	Resident	GB		SW(GB)215	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The re-consultation process has been rushed and poorly presented. The information given is confusing both on-line and at the calendar event in Edenfield. There was no register of visitors to sign on arrival (although I believe one was produced late) to judge the response number. The map on show was indistinct and provided very little info, which had to be looked up in 2 large lever arch files on an individual basis. All this info should have been put up on the walls in a clear form for people to read and discuss. A very amateurial effort.</p> <p>The whole process of reconsidering the GB around Edenfield has been affected by Peel Holdings presenting their plans for houses/roads etc at every site, even those not being considered. Does this mean that a taint approval has already been given by RBC? I am concerned that ANY development would greatly affect the character and ambience at the village and I am wholly opposed to the plan.</p> <p>The notice of the meeting in Edenfield arrived here on Nov 14 and the meeting was called on the 19th. Not enough notice.</p> <p>The consultation ends on the 23rd Dec again a rushed review and suggests it was arranged to thawrt the local residents from expressing their views. The EVRA does not meet in December, the weather and Christmas preparations seriously limit the time available to bring people together to express a unified view and any semblance of a democratic consultation has been ignored. The deadline of the 23rd December should be extended by 2 months to the end of February 2015 to allow a sufficient time for a full and open re-consultation review to be carried out by the residents.</p>
56	Business	GB	The Barn on Rossendale Golf club	SW(GB)218	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Should green belt boundaries be amended it would allow the club to sell the Barn to be converted into a house. The income accrued would ensure the financial stability of Rossendale Golf Club.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
50	Resident	GB		SW(GB)204	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The re-consultation process has been rushed and poorly presented. The information given is confusing both on-line and at the calendar event in Edenfield. There was no register of visitors to sign on arrival (although I believe one was produced late) to judge the response number. The map on show was indistinct and provided very little info, which had to be looked up in 2 large lever arch files on an individual basis. All this info should have been put up on the walls in a clear form for people to read and discuss. A very amateurial effort.</p> <p>The whole process of reconsidering the GB around Edenfield has been affected by Peel Holdings presenting their plans for houses/roads etc at every site, even those not being considered. Does this mean that a taint approval has already been given by RBC? I am concerned that ANY development would greatly affect the character and ambience at the village and I am wholly opposed to the plan.</p> <p>The notice of the meeting in Edenfield arrived here on Nov 14 and the meeting was called on the 19th. Not enough notice.</p> <p>The consultation ends on the 23rd Dec again a rushed review and suggests it was arranged to thawrt the local residents from expressing their views. The EVRA does not meet in December, the weather and Christmas preparations seriously limit the time available to bring people together to express a unified view and any semblance of a democratic consultation has been ignored.</p> <p>The deadline of the 23rd December should be extended by 2 months to the end of February 2015 to allow a sufficient time for a full and open re-consultation review to be carried out by the residents.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
49	Resident	GB	Pinfold	SW(GB)216	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The re-consultation process has been rushed and poorly presented. The information given is confusing both on-line and at the calendar event in Edenfield. There was no register of visitors to sign on arrival (although I believe one was produced late) to judge the response number. The map on show was indistinct and provided very little info, which had to be looked up in 2 large lever arch files on an individual basis. All this info should have been put up on the walls in a clear form for people to read and discuss. A very amateurial effort.</p> <p>The whole process of reconsidering the GB around Edenfield has been affected by Peel Holdings presenting their plans for houses/roads etc at every site, even those not being considered. Does this mean that a taint approval has already been given by RBC? I am concerned that ANY development would greatly affect the character and ambience at the village and I am wholly opposed to the plan.</p> <p>The notice of the meeting in Edenfield arrived here on Nov 14 and the meeting was called on the 19th. Not enough notice.</p> <p>The consultation ends on the 23rd Dec again a rushed review and suggests it was arranged to thawrt the local residents from expressing their views. The EVRA does not meet in December, the weather and Christmas preparations seriously limit the time available to bring people together to express a unified view and any semblance of a democratic consultation has been ignored.</p> <p>The deadline of the 23rd December should be extended by 2 months to the end of February 2015 to allow a sufficient time for a full and open re-consultation review to be carried out by the residents.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
48	Resident	GB	Pinfold	SW(GB)214	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The re-consultation process has been rushed and poorly presented. The information given is confusing both on-line and at the calendar event in Edenfield. There was no register of visitors to sign on arrival (although I believe one was produced late) to judge the response number. The map on show was indistinct and provided very little info, which had to be looked up in 2 large lever arch files on an individual basis. All this info should have been put up on the walls in a clear form for people to read and discuss. A very amateurial effort.</p> <p>The whole process of reconsidering the GB around Edenfield has been affected by Peel Holdings presenting their plans for houses/roads etc at every site, even those not being considered. Does this mean that a taint approval has already been given by RBC? I am concerned that ANY development would greatly affect the character and ambience at the village and I am wholly opposed to the plan.</p> <p>The notice of the meeting in Edenfield arrived here on Nov 14 and the meeting was called on the 19th. Not enough notice.</p> <p>The consultation ends on the 23rd Dec again a rushed review and suggests it was arranged to thawrt the local residents from expressing their views. The EVRA does not meet in December, the weather and Christmas preparations seriously limit the time available to bring people together to express a unified view and any semblance of a democratic consultation has been ignored.</p> <p>The deadline of the 23rd December should be extended by 2 months to the end of February 2015 to allow a sufficient time for a full and open re-consultation review to be carried out by the residents.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
47	Resident	GB	Blackburn Road	SW(GB)208	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The re-consultation process has been rushed and poorly presented. The information given is confusing both on-line and at the calendar event in Edenfield. There was no register of visitors to sign on arrival (although I believe one was produced late) to judge the response number. The map on show was indistinct and provided very little info, which had to be looked up in 2 large lever arch files on an individual basis. All this info should have been put up on the walls in a clear form for people to read and discuss. A very amateurial effort.</p> <p>The whole process of reconsidering the GB around Edenfield has been affected by Peel Holdings presenting their plans for houses/roads etc at every site, even those not being considered. Does this mean that a taint approval has already been given by RBC? I am concerned that ANY development would greatly affect the character and ambience at the village and I am wholly opposed to the plan.</p> <p>The notice of the meeting in Edenfield arrived here on Nov 14 and the meeting was called on the 19th. Not enough notice.</p> <p>The consultation ends on the 23rd Dec again a rushed review and suggests it was arranged to thawrt the local residents from expressing their views. The EVRA does not meet in December, the weather and Christmas preparations seriously limit the time available to bring people together to express a unified view and any semblance of a democratic consultation has been ignored.</p> <p>The deadline of the 23rd December should be extended by 2 months to the end of February 2015 to allow a sufficient time for a full and open re-consultation review to be carried out by the residents.</p>
40	Business	GB	Land at Rossendale Golf Club	SW(GB)218	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>I support the proposed boundary change which will, if approved, enable Rossendale Golf Club to sell the land for proposed development (subject of course to planning being approved). The anticipated proceeeds from such a sale will go a long way to putting the Golf Club on to a sound financial footing. This should ensure that a valuable and much used local community resource will continue to provide golfing opportunities to all sections of the Rossendale valley. The club has made great strides in the last few years in terms of significant growth in membership particularly in the ladies and junior sections.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
9	Resident	GB	North of Mill in Irwell Vale	SW(GB)206	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It would impact on views from the footpath which runs to the side and is well used by walkers. It is also close to the Irwell Vale Conservation Area. It is by the river and a popular area. To release this land for housing would enlarge the village substantially and affect the Conservation Area negatively.
8	Resident	GB	Alderwood & Rock Horse Farm	SW(GB)205	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site not suitable for extra housing and difficult access. Leave in Greenbelt.
5	Resident	GB	Land north of Mill in Irwell Vale	SW(GB)206	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It would adversely impact upon local views and affect the openness of the green belt. It would be detrimental to the historic village which is a conservation area with listed buildings. It is also the site of a public footpath.
29	Resident	GB	Greenbelt Land off Eden Street/ Eden Lan	SW(GB)203	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I, along with other local residents, objected to this proposal during the initial consultation process. I still object to the land off Eden Street (directly in front of my house) being taken out of the Green belt for the reasons I gave at the time (obviously minus any Highways and Flooding objections). I agree with the Borough Planning Officer in that Eden Street / Eden Lane is a robust boundary that should be maintained as the current Green Belt Boundary. Regards. Mr Hebb
26	Resident	GB	Edenfield and surrounding areas		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	I have also been given an overview of the remaining areas of Rossendale but do not feel sufficiently competent other than to say that Edenfield and surrounding areas are of great value both aesthetically and economically so I hope that any changes are kept to the bare minimum.
19	Resident	GB	Land north of mill in Irwell Vale	SW(GB)206	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Any new development would ruin the character of the village. There would be no significant benefit of any kind to the original style of the existing housing in the village.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
18	Resident	GB	Land at Blackburn Road by A56	SW(GB)216	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1) The view from our rear and side window looks towards this land. 2) Changing the status of the Green Belt boundary would adversely affect our local and longer distance views and detrimentally affect the openness of the Green Belt. 3) At present horses use the field and there is a variety of wild life present particularly in the undergrowth at the corner of the field. 4) The field abutts the dual carriageway (A56) along one side and as such is unsuitable for development. 5) The character of the village would be adversely affected fro everyone.
17	Resident	GB	Land at Blackburn Road Junction, Edenfie	SW(GB)208	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1) The view from our rear and side window looks towards this land. 2) Changing the status of the Green Belt boundary would adversely affect our local and longer distance views and detrimentally affect the openness of the Green Belt. 3)There is a variety of wild life present within this area of land. 4)The land is adjacent to an already busy road junction, next to the parish church and opposite the village primary school making it unsuitable for development. 5)The character of the village would be adversely affected.
6	Business	GB	Rossendale Golf Club Greens Lane	SW(GB)218	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rossendale Golf Club is a considerable asset to sporting facilities in the area. The potential sale of the land after change of boundary would help to ease the financial state of the club and improve it's assets. Any residential building would be secluded and would benefit the area with good quality housing.
95	Resident Group	GB	Land at A56 Blackburn Road	SW(GB)216	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Criteria 2(d) It would adversely affect local and long distance views.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
84	Partner	GB	Blackburn Road Edenfield (existing Carav	SW(GB)213	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Whilst Site SW(GB)213 is a little distance from National Trust land it is a sizeable area and in principle its removal from the Green Belt is considered to be inappropriate because of the detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The site is an integral part of a considerably larger area of designated Green Belt land, is comparatively conspicuous in longer range views, and despite its current appearance continues to play an important role in maintaining openness as well preventing urban encroachment into rural areas. Accordingly the approach to retain this site within the Green Belt is supported.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
85	Partner	GB	Field Adj Esk Bank off Blackburn Road Ede	SW(GB)214	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Whilst Site SW(GB)214 is a little distance from National Trust land it is a sizeable area and in principle its removal from the Green Belt is considered to be inappropriate because of the detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The site is comparatively conspicuous in longer range views. Accordingly the approach to retain this site within the Green Belt is supported.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
86	Partner	GB	Chatterton Hey	SW(GB)215	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Whilst Site SW(GB)215 is a little distance from National Trust land it is a sizeable area and in principle its removal from the Green Belt is considered to be inappropriate because of the detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The site is comparatively conspicuous in longer range views. In addition to performing an important function in maintaining openness it also provides clear definition of the north-western limit of Edenfield and prevents encroachment into the countryside. Accordingly the approach to retain this site within the Green Belt is supported.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
87	Partner	GB	Land at Blackburn Road by A56	SW(GB)216	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Whilst Site SW(GB)216 is a little distance from National Trust land it is a sizeable area and in principle its removal from the Green Belt is considered to be inappropriate because of the detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The site is comparatively conspicuous in longer range views. Accordingly the approach to retain this site within the Green Belt is supported.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
88	Partner	GB	Land at Plunge Farm, Edenfield	SW(GB)217	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Whilst Site SW(GB)217 is a little distance from National Trust land it is a sizeable area and quite conspicuously located; in principle its removal from the Green Belt is considered to be inappropriate because of the detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The site is visible in longer range views. Accordingly the approach to retain this site within the Green Belt is supported.</p>
90	Resident Group	GB	Pinfold, Bury Road Edenfield	SW(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is the only gap in the buildings along the main route through the village i.e. Bury Road, Market Street, Burnley Road. This gap allows views of the moorland to the east.
92	Resident Group	GB	Land at Blackburn Road Junction Edenfield	SW(GB)208	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Criteria 2 (d)</p> <p>It would adversely affect local and longer distance views, plus the scale of any development would adversely affect the village.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
83	Partner	GB	Edenwood Mill Edenfield	SW(GB)210	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Whilst a reasonable proportion of Site SW(GB)210 is developed, it is in a key location close to the Council's boundary and provides an important Green Belt function around the southern side of Edenfield. In addition it is considered that it remains important that any proposals for this site are assessed against Green Belt policy. Accordingly it is agreed that the Green Belt boundary should be unaltered in this location.</p>
94	Resident Group	GB	Land at Mangle Fold Farm	SW(GB)211	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Criteria 2 (d) It would adversely affect local and longer distance views, plus the size of the field implies a scale of development would adversely affect the village.</p>
91	Resident Group	GB	Garden Areas Behind Rochdale Road Ede	SW(GB)104	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Criteria 2 (D) It would affect views of the Green Belt to the north-east of Rochdale Road</p>
96	Resident Group	GB	Land at Plunge Farm	SW(GB)217	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>A huge plot. We object under Criterial 2(d). It would affect local and long distance views and the scale of development would adversely affect the village.</p>
97	Resident Group	GB	Chatterton Hey	SW(GB)215	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of A huge plot. We object under Criteria 2(d) - it would affect local and long distance views and development of this site would be on a scale which would adversely affect the valley.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
111	Resident	GB	Land at Blackburn road junction, Edenfield	SW(GB)208	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>We are writing to object to the proposal to remove the area of land referred to as SW(GB)208, land at Blackburn Road junction, Edenfield from the Green Belt.</p> <p>1. We own and live at 2 Church Court Edenfield. Based in the attached plan of this site, we believe the area shaded orange referred to in 'Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield, Rossendale' includes land which forms part of the garden of 2 Church Court which we own. On the plan 130116_Green_Belt_Plan_BlackburnRoad (copy attached) a small area of the development site (shaded orange) protrudes into land to the east of the main site. We have outlined this area in red on a second copy of the plan - 130116_Green_Belt_plan_BlackburnRoad_outlinedred, this is also attached to this message. We believe the area edged red forms part of our garden and also the garden of the neighbouring property, number 3 Church Court, Edenfield.</p> <p>In support of this claim we attach copies of the Land Registry plans of Titles to our property. The area edged red on the plan for Title Number LA708504 is the original house and garden. On the plan for Title Number LA599658 the area edged red is adjoining land which forms part of our garden. We understand the land comprising Title Number LA599658 was purchased by previous owners of 2 Church Court a short time after the house was built. It is difficult to be precise given the scale of the plan 130116_Green_Blet_Plan_BlackburnRoad, however, we believe the land in Title Number LA599658 is part of the land we have outlined in red on the second copy of the site plan attacehd- 130116_Green_Belt_Plan_BlacburnRoad_outlined red. As the current owners of Title Number LA599658 we ask that you note our objection to this land, and any other adjoining land in our ownership, being included in the site plan for 'Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield, Rossendale'.</p> <p>2.The proposal to remove the area referred to as site SW(GB)208 from the green belt would, we believe increase the area of the settlement by more than 5%. Hence the proposal to remove this area of land from the green belt does not fulfil the boundary change criteria.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									3. Further if the land comprising SW(GB)208 was removed from the green belt this would detrimentally affect the openness of the Green Belt and impact on both local and longer distance views, including towards Pendle Hill.
118	Developer	GB	Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield	SW(GB)208	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
119	Developer	GB	Land of Burnley Road, Edenfield	SW(GB)201	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
121	Resident	GB	Land at Chatterton Hey	SW(GB)215	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The comments I wish to make are about the specific area of Green Belt in my local village. I absolutely support the above land at Chatterton Hey to be retained in the Green Belt.</p> <p>I would also like to make general comments about the incremental erosion of the Green Belt over the years, particularly where land is valuable and is likely to be redeveloped. There is a considerable amount of derelict land, unused land and wasteland in Lancashire, and in Rossendale, particularly around Bacup, Stacksteads and Waterfoot. Whilst there are extensive areas of existing urban spread that can be developed, expanding the Green belt should be opposed. There is no benefit in reducing the Green Belt in Rossendale when there are large expanses of brownfield sites.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
128	Resident	GB	Land at Plunge Farm	SW(GB)217	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. Loss of grassland would damage the following habitats I species I environments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • invertebrates, birds, conservation interests (due to loss of fungal/lower plant communities) . • historic landscapes whose boundaries form part of ancient field systems . neutral wet lowland grasslands which are botanically species rich. • neutral dry grassland of lowland/upland hay meadows which has a high proportion of broad leaved herbaceous species used by insects/butterflies. <p>2. Loss of woodland I ancient woodland would have the following damaging effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss/diminishing of wooded sites, native shrubs, vegetation, trees inc. beech, sycamore, Scots pine. • loss/diminishing of rare invertebrates, fungi species, areas of archaeological/historical value, public recreation & access, rivers, streams, veteran trees, scrub, bluebell. • fragmentation through land development I road construction. • habitat of the following species (not exclusive) : Brown Hare, Bull Finch, Chiff Chaff, Goshawk, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Green Woodpecker, Hawfinch, Pied Flycatcher, Pipistrelle Bat, Song Thrush, Sparrow hawk, Spotted Flycatcher, Tammy Owl, Tree creeper, Willow Warbler, Woodcock <p>3. Damaging impacts upon rivers and running water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased waste, sewage outflow and urban rubbish being released. • weakening of river/water corridors providing refuge for vegetation/wildlife lost from surrounding areas and a wildlife link from urban to rural lands. • decline in the quality & diversity of river ecosystems, habitats, diversity due to residential development. • changes in the frequency/magnitude of flooding. The altering of seasonal flow patterns impacting on patterns of sediment transport I nutrient exchange in river systems (DoE 1995) • weakening rivers I waterways supporting many species including white clawed crayfish, pipistrelle bats I water vole. <p>X</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									<p>4. Damaging impacts upon ancient & species rich hedgerows: loss of I decline in the conservation value of historically/biologically important hedgerows containing woody species such as hazel, field maple, bluebell and wild animals. *Hedgerow Regulations (DETR 1997).</p> <p>5. Damaging impacts on ponds and standing water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss I diminishing of a diverse range of wetland /aquatic habitats; the biodiversity and ecological integrity of standing water which supports a variety of terrestrial and aquatic habitats and supports wetland species. • loss I diminishment of animal/ plant life dependent on standing water I habitats for their lifecycle • loss I diminishment of macrophytes I macro invertebrates many of which are UK Biodiversity Action Plan (SAP) priority species. • standing water and fringe vegetation are important for birds particularly breeding birds. <p>Any proposed alteration in the extents of the brownbelt in this area would almost certainly give the green light to development and would have a devastating and irreversible impact on its most vital asset - the environment. It would destroy vast swathes of vital greenbelt land and severely weaken and destroy much of the boroughs ecological and biodiversity balance which is so vital in the 21st century. To then replace this ecological destruction with new housing estates, roads, transport, all of which would generate new increased carbon emissions is not only environmentally damaging, it undermines earlier local and national strategies promoting the need for carbon emissions reductions.</p>
67	Resident	GB	Greens Lane, Haslingden Rossendale Golf	SW(GB)218	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>These changes, being relatively minor, will maintain the existing tree line boundary on Greens Lane whilst at the same time will allow Rossendale Golf Club to develop the area in a manner sympathetic to the surrounding area.</p> <p>This will ensure the future financial viability of Rossendale Golf Club, allowing them to continue to provide leisure facilities for both residents of all age groups and businesses in the Rossendale Valley, something it has continued to do since 1903.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
68	Resident	GB	Land at Mangle Fold Farm Edenfield	SW(GB)211	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. Loss of grassland would damage the following habitats I species I environments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • invertebrates, birds, conservation interests (due to loss of fungal/lower plant communities) . • historic landscapes whose boundaries form part of ancient field systems . neutral wet lowland grasslands which are botanically species rich. • neutral dry grassland of lowland/upland hay meadows which has a high proportion of broad leaved herbaceous species used by insects/butterflies. <p>2. Loss of woodland I ancient woodland would have the following damaging effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss/diminishing of wooded sites, native shrubs, vegetation, trees inc. beech, sycamore, Scots pine. • loss/diminishing of rare invertebrates, fungi species, areas of archaeological/historical value, public recreation & access, rivers, streams, veteran trees, scrub, bluebell. • fragmentation through land development I road construction. • habitat of the following species (not exclusive) : Brown Hare, Bull Finch, Chiff Chaff, Goshawk, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Green Woodpecker, Hawfinch, Pied Flycatcher, Pipistrelle Bat, Song Thrush, Sparrow hawk, Spotted Flycatcher, Tammy Owl, Tree creeper, Willow Warbler, Woodcock <p>3. Damaging impacts upon rivers and running water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased waste, sewage outflow and urban rubbish being released. • weakening of river/water corridors providing refuge for vegetation/wildlife lost from surrounding areas and a wildlife link from urban to rural lands. • decline in the quality & diversity of river ecosystems, habitats, diversity due to residential development. • changes in the frequency/magnitude of flooding. The altering of seasonal flow patterns impacting on patterns of sediment transport I nutrient exchange in river systems (DoE 1995) • weakening rivers I waterways supporting many species including white clawed crayfish, pipistrelle bats I water vole. <p>X</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									<p>4. Damaging impacts upon ancient & species rich hedgerows: loss of I decline in the conservation value of historically/biologically important hedgerows containing woody species such as hazel, field maple, bluebell and wild animals. *Hedgerow Regulations (DETR 1997).</p> <p>5. Damaging impacts on ponds and standing water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss I diminishing of a diverse range of wetland /aquatic habitats; the biodiversity and ecological integrity of standing water which supports a variety of terrestrial and aquatic habitats and supports wetland species. • loss I diminishment of animal/ plant life dependent on standing water I habitats for their lifecycle • loss I diminishment of macrophytes I macro invertebrates many of which are UK Biodiversity Action Plan (SAP) priority species. • standing water and fringe vegetation are important for birds particularly breeding birds. <p>Any proposed alteration in the extents of the brownbelt in this area would almost certainly give the green light to development and would have a devastating and irreversible impact on its most vital asset - the environment. It would destroy vast swathes of vital greenbelt land and severely weaken and destroy much of the boroughs ecological and biodiversity balance which is so vital in the 21st century. To then replace this ecological destruction with new housing estates, roads, transport, all of which would generate new increased carbon emissions is not only environmentally damaging, it undermines earlier local and national strategies promoting the need for carbon emissions reductions.</p>
93	Resident Group	GB	Field Adj Esk Bank off Blackburn Road Ede	SW(GB)214	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Criteria 2 (d) It would adversely affect local and longer distance views, plus the scale of any development would adversely affect the village.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
65	Developer	GB	Land North of Mill in Irwell Vale	SW(GB)206	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Introduction These representations are made by Lea, Hough & Co on behalf of the owner of the land at Irwell Vale Mill, Irwell Vale.</p> <p>Previously representations have made been, advocating the release of the site from the Green Belt. These submissions are intended to comment on the proposed criteria used by the Council in relation to the Green Belt review, but they also reinforce those comments made previously.</p> <p>Site Summary The land at Irwell Vale adjoins the existing Mill premises, which forms the northern settlement boundary for the village of Irwell Vale. The Mill is presently operational, but initial discussions have been undertaken with the Council regarding the potential redevelopment of the site for residential use.</p> <p>The existing premises are in generally poor condition and are not considered suitable for long term employment or commercial uses and therefore an alternative must be sought. Considering the location, on the edge of the village, a residential use offers the most opportunity for a sensitive, integrated and viable development.</p> <p>The land currently within the Green Belt is formed by two fields, located between the Rover Ogden and Irwell Vale Road. The northernmost field- identified as Area B on the analysis of Green Belt sites by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects on behalf of the Council, is considered least suitable for development.</p> <p>Area A, however, immediately adjoins the Mill building, whilst to the north an established tree line forms a clear demarcation.</p> <p>Area A could be brought forward, alongside the redevelopment of the Mill site, to form an attractive and sympathetic approach to the existing village. A new, clear and defensible boundary would be established through the improvement of the existing tree line between Area A and B.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>The landscape assessment undertaken by the Council states, Area A could be developed, with a sensitive proposal that is in keeping with the surroundings, small scale terrace or mews type housing that relates neatly to the existing factory building and creates an appropriate setting at the entrance to the village could make a positive impact.</p> <p>These comments are fully endorsed by the landowner. The site would form an attractive development that would help to broaden the housing offer within the Borough.</p> <p>Green Belt Criteria Paragraph 80 of the NPPF states clearly what function Green Belt land is intended to perform.</p> <p>The five criteria laid out therein are clear and objective. They have formed the basis of Green Belt Reviews in Blackburn with Darwen, Sefton, Knowsley and West Lancashire. In Knowsley and West Lancashire the methodology and conclusions of the Green Belt review have been tested at examination. The Inspectors appointed have provided general support for the process followed by these Local Planning Authorities.</p> <p>Whilst in those authorities Green Belt releases were considered necessary to provide a significant element of the respective land supplies, it is nonetheless appropriate to question why an approach based on the specific criteria set out in Paragraph 80 has not been implemented by Rossendale Council.</p> <p>It is implied by the Consultation that land will be released from the Green Belt, providing it meets particular criteria. The Consultation is not intended as a 'tidying up' exercise, otherwise amendments would have been limited to cartographic errors or obvious discrepancies. Instead, the function the land plays as part of the Green Belt plays a key role in the Consultation.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that those criteria should have mirrored those set out in national planning guidance and tested at Examination elsewhere.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>Proposed Criteria</p> <p>The Consultation documentation states that; “Changes to the existing Green Belt will only be made in exceptional circumstances where they are small scale and would not increase the overall area of the existing settlement (in combination with other Green Belt changes) by more than 5%, where the following criteria are satisfied: 1) Existing Green Belt boundaries will only be amended where: a) Cartographic errors have occurred; or b) The current boundary defining the extent of the Green Belt is un-identifiable, intermittent and/or indefensible on the ground 2) Land will only be considered for removal from the Green Belt where: a) It would not significantly reduce the current distance between settlements and built up areas separated by Green Belt; and b) The site perimeter is directly adjacent to the Urban Boundary; and c) It would not hinder urban regeneration of derelict, vacant and/or previously developed land in adjacent or neighbouring settlements having regard to: i) The amount of derelict, vacant and/or previously developed land available within the Urban Boundary of adjacent or neighbouring settlements capable of meeting development needs; and d) It would not adversely impact upon local and longer distance views or detrimentally affect the openness of the Green Belt; and e) It would not be detrimental to the setting and/or special character of historic towns and settlements; and f) It does not make a significant contribution to the beneficial use of the Green Belt.”</p> <p>Would not increase the overall area of the existing settlement (in combination with other Green Belt changes) by more than 5%... Within the current consultation documentation there does not appear to be any specific justification for the proposed five percent limit within the criteria.</p> <p>The NPPF, at paragraph 80, states clearly the Green Belt serves five purposes: 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other land.</p> <p>It is clear, by way of omission, that the amount of land being released in relation to a settlement is not a valid or objective measure of the usefulness of land within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Sites should be considered against the criteria set out within the NPPF. If they do not perform a substantive role in the functioning Green Belt, it is unnecessary to keep such land within the Green Belt, as stated within paragraph 85 of the NPPF: 85. When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should.... - not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open; It is therefore considered that the five percent limit should be removed from the criteria as being unnecessary and contrary to the aims of supporting sustainable development.</p> <p>Remaining Proposed Criteria Notwithstanding the position outlined above in relation to the proposed criteria, further comments are provided on the Consultation criteria below. a) It would not significantly reduce the current distance between settlements and built up areas separated by Green Belt; and Whilst the assessment of whether a distance is significant or otherwise can only be determined on a case by case basis, the overall tone reflects the NPPF, to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. The site at Irwell Vale is at least 800m from the southern edge of Helmshore, crossing Rossendale Golf Course. The proposed release site would have not detrimental impact on the current separation distance and would not lead to the coalescence of any two settlements. The topography of Irwell Vale reinforces this point, such that any development would not have an impact on any inter-visibility between two settlements.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>The site is also clearly defined, by the River Ogden, Irwell Vale Road and the existing Mill to its boundaries. To the northern boundary, as noted by the Council's Landscape Appraisal, an existing tree line could be substantiated to clearly mark a new Green Belt boundary that is defensible in the long term.</p> <p>b) The site perimeter is directly adjacent to the Urban Boundary; and</p> <p>The criterion again reflects, somewhat, the first three points of Paragraph 80 of the NPPF Green Belt.</p> <p>The proposed site clearly abuts the settlement boundary of Irwell Vale.</p> <p>c) It would not hinder urban regeneration of derelict, vacant and/or previously developed land in adjacent or neighbouring settlements having regard to:</p> <p>i) The amount of derelict, vacant and/or previously developed land available within the Urban Boundary of adjacent or neighbouring settlements capable of meeting development needs; and</p> <p>This criterion reflects the NPPF "to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other land".</p> <p>The removal of Area A from the Green Belt would assist with the redevelopment of the Mill site, enabling an appropriate built form to be created to provide an attractive, interesting approach to the village.</p> <p>The site at Irwell Vale is almost unique within the Borough and, as such, offers the opportunity to deliver high quality housing in an attractive setting. The development is unlikely to compete, in terms of anticipated house purchasers, with urban regeneration sites and it is fundamental to the soundness of any future Local Plan, and Site Allocations document, that the Council provides for a range of housing sites, delivering a distinct and broad offer.</p> <p>d) It would not adversely impact upon local and longer distance views or detrimentally affect the openness of the Green Belt; and</p> <p>This criterion reflects the intended effects of the first three bullet points of Paragraph 80 of the NPPF.</p> <p>As noted above, Area A does not have a significant impact on the local or long distance views.</p> <p>The openness of the Green Belt in this area is adversely affected by</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<p>the existing tree line to the north. A sensitive and well-designed scheme would not extend beyond this boundary and therefore would not unduly impact on the openness of the locality.</p> <p>e) It would not be detrimental to the setting and/or special character of historic towns and settlements; and This criterion corresponds with the fourth bullet point of Paragraph 80. It is therefore considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>Irwell Vale is, in part, covered by Conservation Area status. The existing Mill falls outside the protected area, but has previously been identified through the Conservation Area Appraisal of Irwell Vale as a location where “sensitive redevelopment would be welcomed”.</p> <p>Area A would constitute a logical and enhancing extension to such redevelopment, enabling a scheme to come forward that creates a gradual integration from rural to urban environment.</p> <p>f) It does not make a significant contribution to the beneficial use of the Green Belt.”</p> <p>It is unclear what “beneficial use” this criterion is intended to protect and it does not conform to the Paragraph 80 criteria.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>The proposed criteria of the Green Belt review should more accurately reflect- indeed, they should repeat- those laid out within Government guidance. Those criteria have been assessed independently and the approach found to be sound.</p> <p>Considering the release of Green Belt sites is identified as being suitable by the Council, an objective assessment should be undertaken.</p> <p>The five percent limit imposed by the criteria is neither justified nor necessary. Land within the Green Belt is required to perform a clear Green Belt function. If it does not do so, it is not necessary to preserve it.</p> <p>The site at Irwell Vale Mill is, however, appropriate for release both under the proposed criteria (disregarding the five percent limit) but also the NPPF guidance.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									<p>It is a suitable site for development. It is contained and can create a more defensible Green Belt boundary. It offers the opportunity to deliver an attractive approach to the existing village and to integrate the built form more effectively into its surroundings.</p> <p>The development of the land will give a strong yet harmonious entrance to the village and has potential to improve the existing settlement substantially with a sensitive and considered design approach that takes into consideration the existing constraints, but also the natural opportunities available on the site.</p> <p>Development would increase the availability, choice and quality of housing within the village for the future, strengthening the existing community and ensuring the sustainability of village life in the future.</p> <p>A well-composed development would set a strong, defensible boundary for the settlement and the Green Belt well beyond the Plan Period.</p>
82	Partner	GB	Land at Blackburn Road Junction Edenfiel	SW(GB)208	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Whilst Site SW(GB)208 is a little distance from National Trust land it is a sizeable area and in principle its removal from the Green Belt is considered to be inappropriate because of the detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The site is comparatively conspicuous in longer range views. Accordingly the approach to retain this site within the Green Belt is supported.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
62	Resident	GB		SW(GB)217	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. Loss of grassland would damage the following habitats / species /environments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - invertebrates, birds, conservation interests (due to loss of fungal/lower plant communities) - historic landscapes whose boundaries form part of ancient field systems - neutral wet lowland grasslands which are botanically species rich - neutral dry grassland of lowland/upland hay meadows which has a high proportion of broad leaved herbaceous species used by insects/butterflies <p>2. Loss of woodland / ancient woodland would have the following damaging effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss/diminishing of wooded sites, native shrubs, vegetation, trees inc. beech, sycamore, Scots pine - loss /diminishing of rare invertebrates, fungi species, areas of archeological/historical value, public recreation & access, rivers, streams, veteran trees, scrub, bluebell - fragmentation through land development / road construction - habitat of the following species (not exclusive): Brown Hare, Bull Finch, Chiff Chaff, Goshawk, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Green Woodpecker, Hawfinch, Pied Flycatcher, Pipistrelle Bat, Song Thrush, Sparrow Hawk, Spotted Flycatcher, Tammy Owl, Tree Creeper, Willow Warbler, Woodcock <p>3. Damaging impacts upon rivers and running water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased waste, sewage outflow and urban rubbish being released - weakening of river/water corridors providing refuge for vegetation/wildlife lost from surrounding areas and a wildlife link from urban to rural lands - decline in the quality and diversity of river ecosystems, habitats, diversity due to residential development - changes in the frequency/ magnitude of flooding. The altering of seasonal flow patterns impacting on patterns of sediment transport / nutrient exchange in river systems (DoE 1995) - weakening rivers/waterways supporting many species including white clawed crayfish, pipistrelles bats / water vole <p>4. Damaging impacts upon ancient & species rich hedgerows:</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss / diminishing of a diverse range of wetland / aquatic habitats; the biodiversity and ecological integrity of standing water which supports a variety of terrestrial and aquatic habitats and supports wetland species - loss/ diminishment of animal / plant life dependent on standing water / habitats for their lifecycle - loss / diminishment of macrophytes / macro invertebrates many of which are UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority species - standing water and fringe vegetation are important for birds particularly breeding birds <p>Any proposed alteration in the extents of the brownbelt in this area would almost certainly give the green light to development and would have a devastating and irreversible impact on its most vital asset - the environment. It would destroy vast swathes of vital green belt land and severely weaken and destroy much of the borough's ecological and biodiversity balance which is so vital in the 21st century. To then replace this ecological destruction with new housing estates, roads, transport, all of which would generate new increased carbon emissions is not only environmentally damaging, it undermines earlier local and national strategies promoting the need for carbon emissions reductions.</p>

10	Resident	GB	Edenfield Area		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No comments submitted
----	----------	----	----------------	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
61	Resident	GB	Land at Mangle Fold Farm	SW(GB)211	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. Loss of grassland would damage the following habitats / species /environments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - invertebrates, birds, conservation interests (due to loss of fungal/lower plant communities) - historic landscapes whose boundaries form part of ancient field systems - neutral wet lowland grasslands which are botanically species rich - neutral dry grassland of lowland/upland hay meadows which has a high proportion of broad leaved herbaceous species used by insects/butterflies <p>2. Loss of woodland / ancient woodland would have the following damaging effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss/diminishing of wooded sites, native shrubs, vegetation, trees inc. beech, sycamore, Scots pine - loss /diminishing of rare invertebrates, fungi species, areas of archeological/historical value, public recreation & access, rivers, streams, veteran trees, scrub, bluebell - fragmentation through land development / road construction - habitat of the following species (not exclusive): Brown Hare, Bull Finch, Chiff Chaff, Goshawk, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Green Woodpecker, Hawfinch, Pied Flycatcher, Pipistrelle Bat, Song Thrush, Sparrow Hawk, Spotted Flycatcher, Tammy Owl, Tree Creeper, Willow Warbler, Woodcock <p>3. Damaging impacts upon rivers and running water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased waste, sewage outflow and urban rubbish being released - weakening of river/water corridors providing refuge for vegetation/wildlife lost from surrounding areas and a wildlife link from urban to rural lands - decline in the quality and diversity of river ecosystems, habitats, diversity due to residential development - changes in the frequency/ magnitude of flooding. The altering of seasonal flow patterns impacting on patterns of sediment transport / nutrient exchange in river systems (DoE 1995) - weakening rivers/waterways supporting many species including white clawed crayfish, pipistrelles bats / water vole <p>4. Damaging impacts upon ancient & species rich hedgerows:</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss / diminishing of a diverse range of wetland / aquatic habitats; the biodiversity and ecological integrity of standing water which supports a variety of terrestrial and aquatic habitats and supports wetland species - loss/ diminishment of animal / plant life dependent on standing water / habitats for their lifecycle - loss / diminishment of macrophytes / macro invertebrates many of which are UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority species - standing water and fringe vegetation are important for birds particularly breeding birds <p>Any proposed alteration in the extents of the brownbelt in this area would almost certainly give the green light to development and would have a devastating and irreversible impact on its most vital asset - the environment. It would destroy vast swathes of vital green belt land and severely weaken and destroy much of the borough's ecological and biodiversity balance which is so vital in the 21st century. To then replace this ecological destruction with new housing estates, roads, transport, all of which would generate new increased carbon emissions is not only environmentally damaging, it undermines earlier local and national strategies promoting the need for carbon emissions reductions.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
76	Partner	GB	Southern End of Georgia Pacific Mills Stu	SW(GB)108	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Site SW(GB)108 is close to the Trust's land holdings at Stubbins. It appears to the Trust that this land continues to perform important Green Belt functions and that there is no justification to consider amending the boundary in this location. Accordingly the intention to leave the boundary as it currently stands is supported.</p>
77	Partner	GB	Land Rear of Georgia Pacific	SW(GB)109	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Site SW(GB)109 is close to National Trust land at Stubbins and potentially its de-allocation is a matter of some concern. However, the modest change proposed does reflect the reality on the ground in terms of the building development that has taken place. On the basis of specific boundary change as shown in the consultation document National Trust does not object to this alteration.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
78	Partner	GB	Land Near Springfield	SW(GB)110	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Site SW(GB)110 is close to National Trust land at Stubbins. It is agreed that the current boundary of the Green Belt is well defined and that as a result it is robust. The Green Belt is not entirely undeveloped and there is no reason why land with some development upon it should not be retained within the Green Belt where, as in this instance, it continues to perform important Green Belt functions. Accordingly it is agreed that the current boundary should be retained in this location.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
81	Partner	GB	Land off Eden Street Edenfield	SW(GB)203	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Whilst Site SW(GB)203 is a little distance from National Trust land it is quite sizeable area and in principle its removal from the Green Belt is considered to be inappropriate because of the detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. Accordingly the approach to retain this site within the Green Belt is supported.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
80	Partner	GB	Pinfold Bury Road Edenfield	SW(GB)201	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Site SW(GB)201 is a little distance away from the nearest National Trust land but nonetheless potentially quite visible in views across the valley bottom and beyond. This is a sizeable site and its loss from the Green Belt should indeed be resisted, including having regard to the potential loss of openness in long range views from higher ground to the west. Accordingly the approach to retain this site within the Green Belt is supported.</p>

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
79	Partner	GB	Rear Stubbins Vale Mill	SW(GB)111	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>National Trust is a significant land owner in the area in respect of its interests at Stubbins and Holcombe Moor (a plan showing the extent of its land ownership can be provided on request) both within Rossendale and adjacent to its western boundary. For the most part this is open access land that provides extensive recreational and leisure opportunities not only for Rossendale and Bury residents and employees but also for those from further afield. Apart from the important range of diverse habitats and the cultural heritage interests relating to the Trust's land it is particularly notable and attractive because of the wide ranging views available from the higher parts. Those views are extensive and greatly valued by users of the land. It is within that context that this response is made.</p> <p>Site SW(GB)111 is close to the Trust's land holdings at Stubbins. It appears to the Trust that this land continues to perform important Green Belt functions and that there is no justification to consider amending the boundary in this location. The existing boundary is well defined by the track and accordingly the intention to leave the boundary as it currently stands is supported.</p>
AREA			Waterfoot						
30	Resident	GB	Land adjacent Tenterheads	WCW(GB)101	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land in field top end of Tenterheads developed. Now causing a drainage problem for house top of Hardman Close.
23	Resident	GB	Hardman Close	WCW(GB)101	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Support the change
AREA			Whitworth						
107	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The area of land has been virtually cut off by the completion of the houses on Longacres Drive. Access is now only possible by roads being built across the existing Green Belt. Returning the site into the Green Belt would preserve the open aspect of the area.
109	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
110	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	At least it's one piece of land that cannot have a windfarm placed on it!
120	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I want the land to be returned to the Green belt.
64	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>We were against the original planning application by Bower Construction to build a large number of dwellings on the land specified in the green belt assessment. We fought this application successfully which resulted in Adrian/Anthony Bower building on the then proposed access road (infill plot) between 41 and 43 Longacres Drive. This in effect blocked any access to the plot, taking into account the access for emergency vehicles and such like. We welcome any proposal to return this land back into the Green Belt. There is enough land in the Whitworth valley (Brownfield) to build on without resorting to the use of Green Belt for urban dwellings.</p> <p>We purchased our property some 23 years ago, to live in a landscape with open views, next to the country side with a quality of life. We see this being gradually eroded, especially with the latest installation of heavily subsidised, industrial constructions commonly known as wind farms all around the valley. We completely support the return to Green Belt status.</p>
125	Partner	GB	Land adjacent to Albert Mill	WH(GB)204	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	United Utilities has a large existing sewer running through the site therefore we are flagging this as a constraint which needs further consideration. We would ask any future developer(s) to contact us to explore options for addressing this as early as possible.
60	Resident	GB	Land adjacent to Albert Mill, Whitworth	WH(GB)204	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is better that this land be kept in the green belt than to use it for housing, as there is already too much new housing being constructed in Whitworth, without prospects of local long-term propely paid jobs, and commuting is difficult because of traffic congestion, not to mention its adverse effect on the environment. These objections also apply to the other grade 2 sites in Whitworth.
101	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
126	Partner	GB	Cowm Water Treatment Works	ADD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	We have enclosed a Location Plan showing the site boundaries of United Utilities' Cowm Water Treatment Works in Whitworth. The site is currently located within the Green Belt. In light of the current consultation, we would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss the potential for alternative uses at this site, which is expected to become available during the plan period.
115	Resident	GB	Longacres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clear green field boundaries are key to supporting the natural habitats of the local wildlife in moorland areas.
106	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As a council we have to keep our open spaces for our valley. Brown Wardle is a valuable asset to Rossendale and Whitworth for numerous outdoor activities. We are loosing enough of our moorland.
105	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The site in question has never been developed, and the original access point has been built over by dwellings, making the site inaccessible without serious incursion into the Green Belt to form a new road.
104	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The site should be returned to Green Belt which would then make a natural parallel Green belt area running north to south between urban properties adjacent to the A671, ie Longacres Drive, Whitworth Square and Tonacliffe, and the open moorland of Middle Hill, Brown Wardle and Hodge Hill.
102	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	To maintain the perception of openness and to protect the land from any future development, whatever that may be.
100	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I support this Council proposal. This land is 'considered as Green Belt' and supports its areas general 'Countryside' aspect and use as a walking, countryside area - quality of life! Whitworth has significant amounts of derelict brownsite - ripe for development - that would actually enhance the town - therefore there is no need to develop this area of Longacres. Future access to the land very difficult for development.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
99	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The reasons for this area to be part of the Green Belt are well documented and there are no reasons for any change in this stance. I believe this area was originally in the Green Belt and its change in status was due to, should we say, poor decision making in the past.
66	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It would protect the existing Green Belt Land and views, which enhance the area, which attracts people to the area.
70	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The building line for Whitworth, in particular that approaching Brown Wardle, should not be allowed to encroach on the existing Green Belt land.
71	Resident	GB	Longacres Farm Site	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I would be grateful if you would accept this email as response to the green belt boundary review. In particular, I would like to support, the expansion of the green belt with the inclusion of some land from within the Urban Boundary in the area of Longacres Farm, site ref WH(GB)08 This is also the view of my wife: Dr PJ and Mrs HE Sutherland 7, Longacres Drive Whitworth OL12 8JT We are both of the view that the green belt needs full protection and expansion where feasible. The ecology and ecosystems of this area up to Brown Wardle are delicate and a vital part of the local biodiversity. Development is therefore best restricted to brown field sites elsewhere in the borough. Many thanks Phil Sutherland.
58	Resident	GB	Long Acres farm, Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I fully support and applaud the council's proposal to return this land to green belt. 1. The land was never suitable for development as the two roads which could access it are already inadequate for current usage. 2. The access ways onto the field have now been built on so access is no longer viable. 3. There are many affordable existing houses for sale and or rent in Whitworth, and a good number of more expensive houses up for sale.

ID	Respondent	GB/UB	Site	Site Reference	Support	Object	Neutral	Retain/Conserve land in GB	Reasons
34	Partner	GB	All Whitworth sites		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	At the meeting of Whitworth Town Council last night it was resolved that Council accepts the contents of the reconsultation in relation to the Whitworth area (incorporating Facit & Shawforth /Healy & Whitworth)
44	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	a) It would protect or enhance local and longer distance views and the openness of the Green Belt; and b) It would preserve the setting and/or special character of historic towns and settlements; and c) It would make a significant contribution to the beneficial use of the Green Belt d) It would convert this White Area back to pre 1996 green belt
103	Resident	GB	Long Acres Farm Whitworth	WH(GB)301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Protecting this land from development will help protect the rich local biodiversity and help maintain the pennine character of the area.

Comments Received - Statement of Community Involvement 2014

Consultation dates 19th December 2014 to 23rd January 2015

In total, 16 comments were received regarding the Statement of Community Involvement 2014. A list of the responses received, together with an overview of their comments, is listed below:

Consultation responses

Reference	Organisation (if applicable)	Overview of comments
1	N/A	The draft policy seems fine. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
2	N/A	Thank you for forwarding this for comment. It seems good to me. No comment.
3	N/A	<p>We strongly suspect that your "community involvement" is just a tick-box exercise. Once the public has been "consulted" the planners/council/whoever will simply bring in the changes that have already decided upon.</p> <p>No figures are ever released how many people thought this or that, and even if they were, there is no means of verifying the truth of those figures.</p> <p>Pretending to local people that they have any influence over issues (such as the proliferation of wind farms and unnecessary new housing, for example, both of which Bacup is plagued with) is an outright lie.</p>
4	Highways Agency	<p>I've reviewed the revised SCI and can confirm that the Highways Agency has no comments to make in view of that fact that the document states that we will be consulted as part of the Local Plan making process.</p> <p>Just by way of a general heads-up – subject to the passage of legislation through Parliament, from April 1st 2015 the Highways Agency will be replaced by a new government-owned company that will be known as Highways England. Our contact details however, will remain the same although it is possible that email addresses may change to reflect the new name although no further details are known at this stage. However, all stakeholders will be made aware of these details and the wider changes, closer to the time.</p>
5	Equality and Human Rights Commission	<p>The Commission does not have the resources to respond to all consultations, but will respond to consultations where it considers they raise issues of strategic importance.</p> <p>Local and other public authorities have obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) in the Equality Act 2010 to consider the effect of their policies and decisions on people sharing particular protected characteristics. A link to the technical guidance on how to apply the PSED is provided.</p>

6	Natural England	<p>We are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community by the public, community and other organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters, both in terms of shaping policy and participating in the process of determining planning applications.</p> <p>We regret we are unable to comment, in detail, on individual Statements of Community Involvement but information on the planning service we offer, including advice on how to consult us, can be found at: http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/planningdevelopment/default.aspx.</p> <p>We now ask that all planning consultations are sent electronically to the central hub for our planning and development advisory service at the following address: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk. This system enables us to deliver the most efficient and effective service to our customers.</p>
7	The Coal Authority	<p>Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above document.</p> <p>Having reviewed the document, I note that The Coal Authority is correctly identified as a statutory consultee for Development Plans in Appendix 1, and that you will consult on planning applications in accordance with the provisions of the Development Management Procedure Order.</p> <p>On that basis I can confirm that we have no specific comments to make at this stage.</p>
8	National Trust	<p>Thank you for consulting National Trust on the Draft of the Revised Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>Having reviewed the document, overall it is considered to be well set out and very clearly written – not an easy task to perform.</p> <p>The statement in the second paragraph of section 2.3 (page 9) is welcomed in confirming that those on the Council’s consultation database will continue to be ‘informed of progress and consulted on emerging documents’. However, it appears that Table C on page 12 is not consistent with this approach – specifically in the second row (“<i>Letters or emails to statutory bodies and other general consultees</i>”) it refers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters/e-mails to ‘<i>all relevant bodies on the consultation database</i>’ – surely that should simply be “to all those on the consultation database”? • In the final column this approach is restricted to formal DPDs and SAs...those on the consultation database will also wish to be notified of SPDs, and, as in the case of this consultation, the SCI; it is suggested that these documents are added.

		<p>Section 3.8: a number of useful hyperlinks are provided throughout the draft document, it would be helpful to include one here to the Council's Planning Enforcement Policy.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon this document.</p>
9	NHS Property Services	<p>Appendix 1 of the consultation document gives a non-exhaustive list of statutory consultees for development plan policy and relates to successor bodies where re-organisations occur. On 1st April 2013, 3,200 NHS staff transferred from former Strategic Health Authorities and Primary Care Trusts to NHS Property Services. We work particularly closely with NHS England and the 211 Clinical Commissioning Groups.</p> <p>Future development in Rossendale will have an impact on local GP Primary Care and Community Service provision and I would like to request that we are consulted on key development plan policy and major applications. Please can you ensure that NHS Property Services are included in your list of consultees and that the following email address is added to your database: Local.Plan.North@property.nhs.uk</p> <p>NHS Property Services are a limited company owned solely by the Department of Health and do not represent the wider views of the NHS.</p>
10	English Heritage	<p>Thank you for consulting English Heritage on the above document. At this stage we have no comments to make on its content.</p>
11	Hourigan Connolly	<p>The review of the previous version of the SCI is welcomed and we are grateful of the opportunity to submit comments in the hope that this will make consultation more effective. We feel there are some areas where improvements could be made which would make the determination of planning applications more efficient for all parties concerned. I have set out below our comments on the SCI (December 2014), making reference to the relevant section contained in that document.</p> <p>1.2 Changes to the planning system (page 4) The SCI should make reference in this section to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which was published by the government in March 2014.</p> <p>3.1 Planning Advice Paragraph 3 of Section 3.1 (page 19) refers to the Development Control Charter (the 'Charter'). The SCI states that the Charter will be refreshed in line with the revised SCI; this is encouraged. We would strongly suggest that the Council review the Charter with the view to improving the manner in which planning applications are processed and publicised. I make the following suggestions on the consultation of planning applications:</p> <p>1. <i>Application acknowledged within 3 working days of receipt</i> This procedure is not always observed. We would request that the Council ensure this procedure is adhered to.</p>

		<p><i>2. Statutory Acknowledgement Letter</i></p> <p>It would be helpful to all if the Acknowledgment Letter were to clearly set out the target date for a decision.</p> <p><i>3. Development Control web pages</i></p> <p>The suggestions below would, in our view, improve the way consultation is undertaken:</p> <p>i. Key dates should be filled in correctly. The Received, Registered, Valid, Committee and Decision dates should all be correct so that users of the web pages are clear on these.</p> <p>ii. Revised drawings should be uploaded and labelled appropriately.</p> <p>iii. Statutory and Neighbours Consultee Responses should be uploaded when these are received by the local planning authority.</p> <p>3.6 Planning decisions (page 24)</p> <p>We would request that the local planning authority consider emailing the Decision Notices to agents/applicants in addition to (or instead of) sending them by post. This would quicken up the notification process to the benefit of those awaiting planning decisions.</p>
12	N/A	I have read the Statement of Community Involvement 2014 and it appears to be a sound document.
13	Lancashire County Council	<p>Thank you for your correspondence inviting comments on the above document.</p> <p>Regarding page 4, 1.2, second paragraph - 'the NPPF did not replace all Planning Policy Guidance and Planning Policy Statements in March 2012'. Planning Policy Statement 10 remained until October 2014.</p> <p>Apart from this, having assessed the document with regard to the County Council's strategic objectives and priorities we welcome the release of the document.</p>
14	N/A	I am writing to you about the Neighbourhood Forums - in particular the Bacup Forum because this is the Forum that I attend in my area. The Council have down graded the role of the Forums and they no longer come under the constitution of the Council. There has been a reduction in the number of meetings per year, from four to three Forum Meetings and there is no officer support for the Forums, therefore no formal minutes are taken. Due to the lack of Council support the public attendance at the Forums has reduced. The people representing and reporting on behalf of the Police, Health Service and LCC may have no connection with the local area. The meetings are not now widely advertised on the Council's web site. If the Planning Department is going to use the Local Neighbourhood Forums as part of the planning process, the Forum's status should be upgraded to as it was, at the time of the consultation of the Core Strategy. The meetings should be open to the public and advertised as such and formal minutes should be taken and published, particularly when planning issues are discussed.

		<p>I would also like to raise the issue of 'comments during a specific time period' which is on page 10 of the Statement of Community Involvement 2014. Many local residents in Bacup sent comments to the Planning Department in good faith, commenting on particular issues and because the Council has postponed the consultation that should have taken place in November and December 2014, it seems that their comments will only be noted but will not be included in or analysed and will have no influence on the contents of the plan unless they re-submit them at a further designated time frame. Due the postponement of the consultation by the Council, it would be unfair not to include the comments submitted by residents and it is the Council's responsibility to either inform the residents that sent comments - to re-submit them at the specific time period or to accept the residents comments, when the new consultation date takes place.</p>
15	Rossendale Civic Trust	<p>RCT highlights the breakdowns in communication that can occur when residents are not aware of proposals that might affect them. RCT would hope that in present times, that Members are fully aware of the rules of the consultation process. RCT would suggest that the Statement of Community Involvement needs to take account of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The role of the NPCU - National Planning Casework Unit B. That a Consultation subject would be easier to locate on RBCs web site if it kept to the same title. C. A need to ensure that Location Maps used in a consultation are updated to pick up where changes have followed the consultation. D. Give more Notice of Consultation for Major Projects. E. Ensure those potentially affected are consulted. F. Consultation on work by Consultants for the Local Plan's evidence base is not always accurate. G. Consultation at an early stage where local knowledge could help. H. Consultation needs to be seen to be more than just a "box ticking" exercise on a "done deal". <p>RCT hope that this Statement of Community Involvement 2014 is a genuine promise to consult the public, before engaging in any talks with developers, partners or whoever, on planning matters, and that in particular any planning decisions concerning the RTB Partnership are taken by either a politically neutral meeting of DEVCON, whose Members have no formal involvement with RTB or its parties, or are referred to the NPCU.</p>
16	Lancashire County Council, Internal Audit Service	<p>It certainly reads a lot better [than the Council's previous Statement of Community Involvement] and the fact that it follows a chronological order makes it easy to follow and understand.</p> <p>I have looked back at our previous comments and these have been actioned accordingly except that the document does not clearly state the frequency of review if there are no major changes. It's not a major point because the statement clearly defines changes that would trigger a review - I thought it might be worth considering setting out a review period if the identified trigger points do not occur.</p>

