Mr Andrew Freeman

By email to:
steve.carnaby@intelligentplans.co.uk

Rossendale Borough Council
Forward Planning
The Business Centre
Futures Park
Bacup
Lancashire
OL13 0BB

This matter is being dealt with by: Anne Storah
Contact Number: 01706 252418
Email: annestorah@rossendalebc.gov.uk
Reference: Edenfield NP
Your Ref: 01/AF/ENP
Date: 18 October 2024

Dear Mr Freeman,

Subject: Edenfield Neighbourhood Plan Examination – Response to Procedural Letter

Thank you for your letter dated 7 October 2024, which clarifies procedural matters, and the attached Annex requesting information from Rossendale Borough Council on two matters.

Please see below the response below from the Council's Planning Unit.

1. **Does the Borough Council have any comments to make on the Edenfield Neighbourhood Plan?**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional comments. As you will have seen from the submitted Consultation Document the Council responded previously to the Neighbourhood Forum's consultation. The Forum has now addressed most of the comments raised in the response to the Reg. 14 consultation.

The Neighbourhood Plan references Edenfield as a rural settlement. In the adopted Local Plan's Settlement Hierarchy (Table 1 on page 13) it is defined as an Urban Local Service Centre, recorded as containing the following services, facilities and characteristics:

- Local Centre, Neighbourhood Parade OR more than one shop, including grocery/convenience store or other key service;
- High frequency bus service;
- Education (primary school);
- Health service: GP, Dentist or Pharmacy;
- Community facilities;
- Recreation / sports facility;
- Leisure facility.

The following discrepancies have been noted between the Masterplan Design Code for H66 and the Neighbourhood Plan Design Code.

Adopted Site H66 Masterplan and Design Code	Neighbourhood Plan Design Code	Discrepancies
Built Form – BF1 Up to 15% 2.5 storey house where appropriateness can be demonstrated in Eden Core (10% in Village Streets and Edenfield North, 20% in Chatterton South	USB – Building Height Three or two-storey developments should only be permitted where local topography and views have been accounted for. For H66, development on Area A of Lives and Landscapes Assessment should be no more than two-storey.	Some discrepancies regarding the appropriateness or more than two-storey dwellings.
NA02 – List of trees and shrubs includes non-native species	BE1 – Encourage retention and planting of locally native trees and hedgerows	Use of native versus non-native trees and shrub species within development
MO O4 – secondary streets to be narrower than Market Street. No visitor parking shown or referenced.	ST2 – Secondary streets should have wide carriageway sufficient for vehicular traffic to pass in either direction. Should include visitor parking	Discrepancy regarding width and visitor car parking on secondary streets.

2. **Do you consider that any of the matters identified within Policy HO4 are in conflict with provisions in the Site H66 Masterplan Design Code?**

The Council does not consider that the now adopted Masterplan Design Code necessarily conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan's Policy HO4.

Policy HO4 relates well to the Local Plan's Site Specific Policy for H66, for example, regarding retention and strengthening of the woodland enclosures, and allowing views to the Church. However, the Neighbourhood Plan additionally refers to the Community Centre in Policy HO4, which is not referred to in the Local Plan. Also 1 c of Policy HO4 seems to unnecessarily duplicate Policy 2 of HO4.

The Masterplan refers to some tree cover to be removed whilst strengthening and retaining tree cover on Church Lane. This may be at odds with Policy HO4 1. a) which seeks retention and strengthening of the woodland enclosures to the north and south of the church.

I hope this response is helpful and please contact me if you require any further information as part of the Examination into the Edenfield Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Anne Storah MRTPI
Principal Planner (Forward Planning)