

Hyndburn Borough Council Core Strategy and Accrington AAP Examination

Examination Hearings

Wednesday 28th September 2011

Morning Session

Attendees		
Stephen J Pratt	Planning Inspectorate	SJP
Michael Walker	Programme Officer	MW
Ursula Reilly	Note taker	
Hyndburn Council Team		
Simon Prideaux	Head of Planning and Transportation	SP
Joanne Macholc	Principal Planning Officer	JM
Farooq Rafiq	Assistant Planning Officer	FR
Other Participants		
David Proctor	Planning Policy Team Leader (Blackburn With Darwen Council)	DP
Cllr Harry Grayson	On behalf of Mrs Collinge (Rishton Prospects)	HG

	7C Rishton
HG SJP	Requests to speak on behalf of Prospects. Allows but using discretion as they had made no application to speak should have notified 6 weeks ago.
SJP	Clarification from yesterday - Strategic housing site at Huncoat was considered as part of the SHLAA, Council response was no – after checking SHLAA, SJP seems it has been, but ruled out due to flood risk – and is therefore not part of potential supply.
FR	Yes, was considered but excluded from supply, in addition to flood risk, site also part of Greenbelt
SJP	What is the position re need and supply? SHLAA identifies 301 against a need of 320, is this a concern?
JM	No, SHLAA identifies 301 dwellings deliverable 19 shortfall not of concern. SHLAA starting point and further work confirms that provision can be met.
SJP	Notes that Rishton is constrained by Greenbelt and that there are no ASR's
SJP JM	What is role of Rishton and is it supported by evidence? Covered by retail study which classes as a district centre although CS refers to as local centres.
	<u>7D Knuzden & Whitebirk</u>

SJP	Have received representations from the Rishton Prospects Panel and additional letter from Collings – represented by HG Council's response 219.g provides the basis and justification for employment site at Whitebirk 2 potential elements to Whitebirk – DP from Blackburn here to discuss Whitebirk 1.
SJP	Whitebirk 1 - identified in Hyndburn Local Plan, border goes through district boundary – small part in Blackburn.
SP	Planning application totally in Hyndburn.
SJP	NWDA strategic site (in RES) and covered in Pennine Lancs studies – PL Employment Strategy and PL Spatial Guide.
SP	Planning application received in 2003 but not determined – new Government proposals that want all to be considered in a maximum of 12 months. Recommended for approval subject to S106 being signed (close to signing it), report going to October Committee dealing with amendment to a no. of conditions. Highways Agency have revised a direction, now can develop 88% of the site following completion of transport studies. Implementation plan – this is a phase 1 site.
SJP	how will site be accessed?
SP	Two access points, Northern access from J6, Southern from Blackburn Road, no through route except for buses. Don't want rat run.
SJP	Is it a reasonable prospect in the first part of plan period?
SP	Yes – will start but may not be complete in phase 1.
SJP	Concern at Blackburn examination about purpose and nature of site – local or sub-regional needs.
SP	Hyndburn recognise could meet both sub regional and local needs –with BwD and Hyndburn taking 25% each in terms of employment and 50% for wider
DP	Looking at this, not challenged 25% or 50% within sub region.
SJP	Previously not apportioned – but Hyndburn content with above. Lancashire not objected.
SJP	What changes are proposed in Schedule of further proposed changes?
JM	FPC25 – 29 – changes to terminology used; Schedule of Proposed Changes (May 2011) also replaces 70% with 88%
SJP	Happy plan is consistent with Blackburn with Darwen strategy?
DP	- no issues with consistency.
SJP	Prospects Panel agree should be included, no dispute.
HG	Yes, confirmed
SJP	No funding issues. No link road or access issues. Public sector already paid, no claim on developers. Any contribution to Pennine Reach – no, but additional infrastructure, shuttle bus. Cross boundary working?
SP/DP	Yes

SJP	<u>Turning to Whitebirk 2 –asked the basis for it?</u>
SP	Basis is the MAA
SP	Discussed at length previously at Blackburn examination – was to be considered in Hyndburn Core Strategy not Blackburn.Core Strategy
SJP	Possible future extension of Whitebirk 1 site. Broad basis for Whitebirk 2 comes from Pennine Lancs studies Hyndburn Core Strategy makes clear that Hyndburn don't expect site in current plan period. Is site identified on Key Diagram, Proposals Map Or Policy?
SP	No, not identified. Core Strategy makes no commitment to W2 within plan 2. Broad location identified on aerial photo next to reservoir. Core Strategy sets out particular work that needs to be done before the site could come forward at para 5.67
SJP	Similar criteria in Blackburn with Darwen Core Strategy
DP	2 additional criteria relating to coal reserves and flood risk.
SP	Concerned about Whitebirk 2 causing the merging of Blackburn and Rishton (Greenbelt raises concerns re PPG2) and have sufficient employment land for 15 years to avoid release of strategic site in Greenbelt. Site wholly in Hyndburn. Lot of work to be undertaken.
SJP	Have you made reference to MAA as desired by BwD?
SP	No, want to retain text as it is, position agreed with our Elected Members Important that work at Pennine Lancashire level is not imposed on Hyndburn, work should be undertaken in conjunction with Members and Residents.
DP	Not an issue of soundness but would be an improvement to the plan
SJP	Does not want to impose changes and recognises sensitivities and the need for further work. Recalls joint joint statement to BwD Core Strategy examination for need of a joint study.
SP	Agreed there is a need to look at employment land needs in sub region but not a particular urgency as we have two strategic sites and Junction 7 business park. Planning officer Group to take forward, with elected members. Need to work with residents in climate of localism. Hyndburn to take a lead though Blackburn to have a key role. Sites should also consider sites in Blackburn. Report to PLOG July 2010, need to employ consultants terms of reference and finance.
DP	Blackburn no serious issues with Whitebirk 2. Needs work within 15 years to establish if needed and if Whitebirk best site. Don't want to reach end of 15 years and nothing in place. Document Pennine Lancs Spatial Guide also refers. No commitment to Whitebirk 2 but needs work to look at, as above. Review of potential sites, also other LAs and would include Huncoat.

SJP	Refers to comments from Rishton Prospects panel, concern over Whitebirk 2 – want it deleted. .
HG	Wants it never to be considered for employment site. In view of what said as above – HG still wants no reference to it at all, ruled out. Residents totally opposed – public meetings
SP	Plan in context of Pennine Lancashire strategy – recognise longer term site may be needed in PL. Make sure Whitebirk 2 not only consideration Felt Core Strategy struck reasonable balance – No programme to release site within 15 years and need to consider other sites. Core Strategy provides degree of protection sought by EMs and residents.
SJP	Would removal of reference to Whitebirk 2 make it inconsistent with other plans, given loss of RSS e.g, PL Spatial Guide, PLES, MAA. Referred to test of soundness – documents regard of plans of other LAs. Core Strategy takes long term view. Needs to fit will other documents even though not part of statutory documents, as they contain the aims and aspirations of area. Hyndburn feel it should be there, strategic context of the area.
SJP	Inconsistent if omitted?
SP	Would be inconsistent with Blackburn Strategy.
SJP	Pennine Lancashire – do they have representatives of Officers and Members? Hyndburn members – satisfaction from members?
SP	Yes, Cllr Peter Clarke was member representative on PLLACE Spatial Guide endorsed by joint committee including Councillors Hyndburn and Blackburn – Yes. Referred to PL Spatial Guide and all agreed that it refers to but does not commit to Whitebirk 2.
HG	Wanted clarity on W1, W2, W5 – confused.
SP	Whitebirk 5 is a small existing allocation
SJP	Cllr Grayson wanted to add anything further to discussion?
HG	Rishton close knit community. Suspicious of development. Weren't made aware of any development in area. Important residents and councillors views heard Proud of Greenbelt and distinctiveness of Rishton. Don't want to merge with other areas. Councillor Clarke on panel – beggar's belief as former Rishton resident. Blackburn proposals - audacity to come into Hyndburn and steel land. Already have blighted employment sights in Rishton- could be better utilised. Major fear becoming part of Blackburn, Great Harwood, Clayton le Moors.
SJP	What is Prospects?
HG	Explained, voluntary charity.
SP	Reassure HG lists key spatial interventions in Spatial Guide (Para's 4.11-4.14 Longer Term Actions), whilst mention of Whitebirk 2 – there is no commitment, need to explore potential sites.

	<p>No preconception that Whitebirk 2 will be chosen. Reference to MAA, Page 31, Green belt review required. Para 23 – longer term action Range of alternatives to be considered to ensure most suitable. Lots of qualification to work. Recognise concerns and constraints. Guide talks about enhancing Leisure. Greenbelt. Reference to the Map – factory denotes Whitebirk 1? Possible Whitebirk 2 employment site?</p>
SP	<p>Even if Whitebirk 2 suitable - would still need to go through the planning process and consultation. Decision made by Hyndburn Elected Members. Site allocation stage – Whitebirk 2 would not feature.</p>
SJP	<p>Any challenges from owners of land – no.</p>
SP	<p>No</p>
DP	<p>HG accused you of theft – No response. But draw attention to Para 5.67 and bullet 6 (Core Strategy page 84) – coalescence would be a test in relation to preserving Green belt function. Also wanted further clarification on Para 5.68 which sought inclusion of further wording, not a soundness issue.</p>
SP	<p>Wants no further change – as it is sensitive matter.</p>
DP	<p>Not worried is not pursued, not crucial.</p>
	<p><u>7E Rural Areas</u></p>
SJP	<p>Council sets out its statement in 2.19g SHMA Shows 1.5% households in rural areas.</p>
SJP	<p>Has SHLAA looked at rural sites?</p>
FR	<p>Yes, SHLAA in relation to rural areas looked at a number of sites. As they fall in either rural or greenbelt - were excluded. Gave examples: Sites 280 Belthorn} excluded 182 }</p>
SJP	<p>What numbers will come forward in rural areas?</p>
JM	<p>No figures to hand and no proportion of housing requirement is attributed to rural areas or villages</p>
SJP	<p>Enquired about local need? Policy to be developed in Development Management DPD. For redevelopment or conversion of existing buildings see para 5.75 of CS</p>
SJP	<p>No mention of local needs.</p>
JM	<p>SHMA recognised that may be a need for Affordable Housing in rural areas but needs to be established by local surveys. Not quantified yet – with housing colleagues. SHMA did not quantify need, only small proportion of population live in rural areas – and our rural areas are easily accessible from our urban areas. Could address in Development Management DPD</p>

SJP	Summarised the position on Policy RA3 Altham, Greenbelt being amended to provide for existing occupiers to expand. Site 5.27 hectares. Planning application has been submitted.
SP	Yes – full planning application and a second outline application submitted. First application withdrawn due to weak case, these resubmissions now provide further justification (Supporting information with planning application - Indigo letter – submitted to examination) Continued to summarise justification for greenbelt release. Council taken a pro-active approach in meeting business needs. Company doing well and wanting to consolidate their premises - Hyndburn Borough Council keen to retain. Company competes with China due to high level of automation. See as compelling need.
SJP	Special circumstances set out on basis of business need, Insufficient land on business park to meet Whatmores' needs and land directly adjoins existing Ehatmore site.
SP	Wouldn't infringe main purposes of Greenbelt. Summarised letter from Planning Consultant: inefficiencies in moving goods, environmental benefits, etc therefore need to consolidate on one site.
SJP	Is the council satisfied exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated?
SP	Justified in this case 8 Other matters 8.1 Monitoring and Implementation Council's position set out in statement 2.19h Appendix 2 Radical changes – number of indicators vastly reduced.
FR	Talked through key points i.e. housing mix. Some national indicators withdrawn.
SJP	Referred to document – living document Appendix 1 very useful
(b) Q	Chapter 6. Key element of Core Strategy Taken on board changes needed? Yes I will make sure carried through Make sure no consequential changes needed to Core Strategy.
(c)	Brief response supplied:
FR	Talked through. Appendix 9 relevant i.e. affordable housing. Could include words “if necessary” or “if required”. Had included “and/or”. Build flexibility into policy, - direct link to minerals and waste.

The notes of this meeting are intended as a general account of the meeting and are not a verbatim record

Appendix 9 Contingency
Core Strategy Committed to 5 year review in housing section.
FPC 33
Housing trajectory appendix 4
Chapter 6 –3 5 year phases.

No other reference to 5 year review
Suggest include