



ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF VH LAND PARTNERSHIPS LTD.

IN RELATION TO MATTER 12

AUGUST 2019

INTRODUCTION

1. Gary Hoerty Associates has been instructed by VH Land Partnerships Ltd to submit representations to the Rossendale Local Plan Examination, on behalf of themselves and the landowners, Mr. Mark Schofield and Mrs Helen Tickle, further to its earlier representations to the Regulation 19 Consultation.
2. Our representations relate to Matter 12 (and specifically Allocation H60), as identified by the Inspector.

BACKGROUND

3. Our client, Mr. Mark Schofield and Mrs Helen Tickle, own land, part of which is proposed to be allocated for housing in the plan (site H60). Our clients fully support this proposed allocation but put forward the strong suggestion that this proposed allocation ought to be extended, to include additional land, also in Mr. Schofield's ownership. Our clients also consider the proposed yield from the allocation to be unjustifiably low.
4. These representations relate to proposed allocation H60 and land immediately adjacent to the proposed allocation H60.
5. The site is shown on the attached plan (Appendix 1). You should note that we have suggested the inclusion of this additional land in previous consultations on this Local Plan but our suggestion has not been positively responded to by the Council. You should note that the plan shows two separate sites. The site referred to in this statement is the larger of the two.
6. We are currently at an advanced stage in the preparation of an outline planning application for residential development on the land in our client's ownership i.e. the currently proposed allocated land plus the additional land adjacent to it (Land A) that we are putting forward for allocation. That application has been drawn up following a thorough masterplanning exercise, supported by a Transport Assessment, ecological report, Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and LVIA, amongst other studies. That the

resulting proposal would be sustainable development is therefore well evidenced. We have included the Masterplan as Appendix 2, a Transport Technical Note as Appendix 3 and Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) as Appendix 4.

OUR CASE IN SUPPORT OF THE INCLUSION OF THE ADDITIONAL LAND IN THE ALLOCATION (H60)

7. The additional land that we propose for inclusion in this site allocation, like the land currently proposed for allocation, is designated as countryside in the current Local Plan (Core Strategy). It is however adjacent to the urban boundary and in an equally sustainable location. It should be noted that this additional land would not extend the net developable area but would assist in providing open land, planting and screening i.e. assisting in the setting of the development in the landscape. Factors supporting its inclusion in the proposed allocation are as follows:-
 - a) It presents no significant constraints against its development (access, drainage, flood risk etc), in this respect being similar to the proposed allocation land.
 - b) It would equally support current Core Strategy, emerging Local Plan and national planning objectives, not least in that it would assist in broadening the choice of land for development.
 - c) It would not have an adverse landscape impact. The inclusion of the additional land would enhance the potential for landscape improvement, retention of views and enhancement of green infrastructure.
 - d) It would relate well to existing and proposed development and would not adversely impact on the Higher Clough Fold Conservation Area or Heightside House
 - e) It can be accessed.

8. In reference to bullet point b) above, it should be noted that both the proposed allocation and the extended housing allocation, as proposed by my client, would meet the criteria set out in current Core Strategy Policy 1, relating to extensions to the urban boundary, principally in that:-
 - a) The extension/amendment to the urban boundary would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment such as biological, geological,

geomorphological, green infrastructure and landscape character assets, including habitats and species of importance for nature conservation or should be capable of full mitigation

- b) the amendment/extension would not result in the amalgamation of settlements
- c) the amendment/extension would not result in a significant impact on local views and viewpoints.

9. We would therefore suggest that the urban boundary set out on the proposals map should be revised to include the (extended) site.

10. The extension to the allocation, as proposed by my clients, would allow for a properly planned landscape setting to the development and enable us to ensure the provision of managed open space in the area closest to Heightside House, providing opportunities to secure the future management and retention of woodland areas and, through public accessibility, allow the significance of the listed building to be opened out and appreciated.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED YIELD FROM THE SITE

11. The current suggested allocation for site H60 is for 80 dwellings. As this includes 30 dwellings on that part of site H60 identified as Johnny Barn Farm, the allocation on our client's land would only be for 50 dwellings. The Inspector will note that our Masterplan for the site which, as we have said earlier, is supported by technical evidence, demonstrates that the site can satisfactorily accommodate up to 123 dwellings (at 35 dph). **We therefore suggest that the allocation for site H60 overall be raised to 153 dwellings.**

12. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the number of dwellings allocated for site H60 has been reduced from 105 for the site we have put forward plus 30 on the adjacent site, to its current level of 80 overall. This follows comments from the Council's Conservation Officer. We have assessed the impact of the proposed development on heritage assets, as part of our site analysis and masterplanning work. Our view is that the layout works well. It avoids the more prominent high ground to the north and the listed building to the northeast. It will not adversely impact on the setting either the listed building or the conservation area to the south.

Attached as Appendix 4 is a document entitled 'Comments in respect of Built Heritage prepared by mb Heritage. This will inform a more detailed heritage assessment which will accompany the planning application. This demonstrates that there is no justification for reducing the yield from this site allocation, or indeed reducing or deleting the allocation. Furthermore it makes a clear statement in relation to the benefits of providing open space in the areas we are suggesting for inclusion within the allocation.

13. In conclusion on this point, the proposed yield from the site is considerably understated.

OUR RESPONSE TO THE MIQs

i) Is the site capable of being safely accessed? Have the concerns of the Local Highways Authority been satisfied specifically can the site be safely accessed

14. The planning application will be accompanied by a Transport Statement (included as Appendix 2) which demonstrates that the site can be safely accessed and that the proposed development will not have an adverse impact on the local highway network.

ii) Is the site safe in flood risk terms. What effect would the proposed allocation have on drainage and surface water in the area?

15. The planning application will be accompanied by an FRA (included as Appendix 3) which demonstrates that the site can be satisfactorily drained and that the proposed development will not result in flood risk.

iii) Is the site boundary and site capacity justified and effective?

16. Reference should be made to paragraphs 4 to 11 above. We would however reiterate that the proposed yield from the site is unjustifiably low.

iv) Should the number of dwellings be changed from 80 to 30 dwellings to reflect Planning Approval reference 2015/0517?

17. We see no justification for this, which would effectively remove our client's land from the allocation. The questions raised by the Council's conservation officer regarding the number of dwellings that can be accommodated on the site without adversely impacting on heritage assets are not evidenced. Our own analysis contradicts this and this will be evidenced in our planning application. As stated above an analysis prepared by mb Heritage is attached as Appendix 5.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – The site

Appendix 2 - Masterplan

Appendix 3 - Transport Technical Note

Appendix 4 - Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)

Appendix 5 – Comments in respect of built heritage