

Rossendale Local Plan Examination in Public

Matter 2 (Vision and Spatial Strategy)

Hearing Statement on behalf of Anwyl Land

August 2019

Relevant Site:

Land at Exchange Street, Edenfield (Part of Housing Allocation H72 – Land West of Market Street, Edenfield)

Justin Cove, BA(Hons), MSc, MRTPI
Director

Hive Land & Planning

Lowry Mill, Lees Street, Swinton, Manchester, M27 6DB

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Matter 2 – Vision and Spatial Strategy.....	5

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared on behalf of Anwyl Land and responds to the Issues and Questions raised by the Inspectors in July 2019.
- 1.2 For clarity, this Statement relates to the continued promotion of land at Exchange Street, which forms the southernmost part of the wider proposed Housing Allocation H72 (Land west of Market Street, Edenfield). Up until this point, previous Local Plan representations relating to this site have been submitted by the landowner The Methodist Church. Anwyl Land now have an agreement in place with the Methodist Church and so will be promoting the land at Exchange Street, Edenfield through the remainder of the Examination process with an intention to develop housing at the site.
- 1.3 The parcel of land being promoted by Anwyl Land is accessed via Exchange Street and is capable of accommodating around 90-100 homes. Land to the immediate north forms part of the same allocation and Anwyl Land (as the Methodist Church did before) have engaged with Taylor Wimpey and Peel who are the other landowners in order that the whole allocation is delivered in a co-ordinated manner.
- 1.4 Anwyl Land (represented by Hive Land & Planning) intend to participate in the Matter 2 Hearing session being held on Tuesday 24th September 2019 and trust that this Statement assists the Inspectors in respect of the Examination.

2 Matter 2 – Vision and Spatial Strategy

2.1 This section provides Anwyl Land’s response to the following Issue raised under Matter 2:

“Does the Plan set out a clear vision, strategic objectives and spatial strategy which present a positive framework that is consistent with national policy and will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development?”

2.2 Each of the Inspectors questions are now addressed accordingly.

a) Does the Plan clearly articulate a vision and strategic priorities for the development use of land in Rossendale, in line with legislation and national policy?

2.3 Anwyl Land are satisfied that the Plan accords with the requirements of national policy in relation to the vision and strategic priorities for development in the Borough and have no other specific comments to make.

b) What is the basis for the overall spatial strategy, as set out in Policy SS, which seeks to focus growth and investment in Key Service Centres, on major sites and on well located brownfield sites? Is the strategy and distribution justified and sustainable? What other strategies were considered, and why were they discounted?

2.4 Anwyl Land support the basis for the overall spatial strategy set out in Policy SS and consider the strategy and distribution justified and sustainable.

c) Are the settlement groupings in the Development Hierarchy soundly based and supported by robust evidence?

j) Should Rawtenstall be identified in a different category to the other Key Service Centres?

2.5 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

What category does Edenfield fall under?

2.6 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

Does the hierarchy capture all other relevant settlements in Rossendale?

2.7 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

How do the settlement groupings fit with the Retail Hierarchy in Policy R1?

2.8 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

d) Is the predicted distribution of growth in line with the spatial strategy? To what extent is development focused on Key Service Centres rather than Major Sites? Does it represent an appropriate balance between locational sustainability, and other strategic factors and priorities?

2.9 The view of Anwyl Land is that the right balance has been struck in respect of the distribution of growth, from both a geographical and quantitative perspective.

2.10 It is not sufficient to consider the distribution of growth set out under Policy SS as a matter of Key Service Centres *versus* Major Sites; both sources of housing land supply are needed if the housing land supply position is to improve in Rossendale and then be maintained throughout the plan period.

2.11 The Spatial Strategy is clear that the Major Sites are required to address certain borough-wide needs. The Strategy Topic Paper clearly sets out the rationale behind their inclusion which is then underpinned by the robust evidence base that has been submitted for consideration.

e) What strategic factors/priorities were key in determining the Major Sites?

2.12 In respect of Edenfield, our Matter 14 Hearing Statement clearly sets out the justification for the inclusion of Land west of Market Street as a Major Site (proposed Housing Allocation H72), taking strategic matters into consideration.

2.13 With reference to the evidence base, Document EB001 'Strategy Topic Paper' (2018) confirms the identification of four major sites, with the Edenfield site being the only Housing site. This site is intended to deliver 12.5% of the overall housing requirement for the Borough and the following reasons are cited for its selection:

- *The proposed housing is deliverable with willing developers and would make a significant contribution to overall housing numbers*

- *The land is in an area of high viability for housing and proven market demand. This facilitates building but also provides the opportunity for developer contributions to be secured for affordable housing, appropriate infrastructure and a high standard of design and layout.*
- *Edenfield is close to the M66 and on the X41 bus route so has good accessibility.*
- *It is a Local Service Centre.*
- *The Green Belt Review did not consider that the land performed strongly in Green Belt terms.*

2.14 Development of the site is known to be viable and it is being promoted by three active developers with an excellent track record of delivery in the North West – Anwyl Land, Taylor Wimpey and Peel. There is therefore no question that the site is able to deliver a number of key strategic priorities, including a significant quantum of affordable housing, addressing past under-delivery of housing and creating a more balanced mix of housing.

f) To what extent does the spatial strategy seek to focus development on non-Green Belt sites in the countryside rather than Green Belt land?

2.15 The Strategy Topic Paper (EB001) and Housing Topic Paper (EB006) confirm that the use of brownfield land and the application of higher densities has formed a central element of the site selection process, in line with paragraph 137 of the NPPF.

2.16 Non-Green Belt locations were then considered in considerable detail and sites or areas have been discounted as a result of some key constraints that exist in the borough. One of the primary factors is that the relationship between the urban area and countryside is a key landscape feature of the borough and avoiding urban sprawl up the hillsides is important to help maintain this landscape setting. As a result of this sensitivity and having identified those sites within the existing urban area that are considered to be viable and deliverable or developable, it became apparent that an insufficient number of available sites could be identified to meet Rossendale’s housing requirement within the plan period. Exceptional circumstances therefore existed to consider Green Belt locations for housing delivery and the Major Site at Edenfield was considered appropriate for a number of strategic reasons when compared to other locations, not least the findings of the Green Belt Assessment.

2.17 Anwyl Land therefore consider that all reasonable alternatives have been considered, including in non-Green Belt locations, before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to consider Green Belt release.

g) How has flood risk been factored into decisions about the spatial strategy and distribution of growth?

2.18 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

h) Does Policy SS provide sufficient clarity on the degree of concentration and the distribution of growth?

2.19 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

i) Is Policy SS also intended to be used to determine individual planning applications? In this context are the constraints relating to the scale of growth in Urban Local Service Centres, Rural Local Service Centres and Other Places robustly based and adequately defined? Would the policy allow effective re-use of brownfield sites in sustainable village locations?

2.20 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

j) Is the approach to development in the countryside, as set out in the first paragraph of Policy SD2, justified? What type of development needs to be in a countryside location?

2.21 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

k) Are the Urban Boundaries clearly defined and robustly based? Are the proposed boundary changes to reflect existing development on the ground, provide defensible edges and correct errors, as set out in document EL1.002d, justified?

2.22 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

l) To what extent does the Plan seek to reduce out-commuting and promote greater self-containment? Is a significant shift in commuting patterns attainable?

2.23 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.

m) Does Policy SD1 adequately reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development?

2.24 Anwyl Land have no specific comments to make in response to this question.



Hive Land & Planning

Lowry Mill, Lees Street, Swinton, Manchester, M27 6DB