

Hyndburn Borough Council Core Strategy and Accrington AAP Examination

Examination Hearings

Tuesday 27th September 20110

Afternoon Session

Attendees		
Stephen J Pratt	Planning Inspectorate	SJP
Michael Walker	Programme Officer	MW
Steve Watson	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
Cllr Bernard Dawson	Chair of Planning Committee	BD
Other Participants		
David Mason		DM
Katie Dent	Omega Atlantic	KD
Tim Rainbird	Quod Planning representing Omega Atlantic	TR
Andrew Gardner-Chan		AGC
Roy Chetham	Huncoat Community Forum	RC
Susan Bolton	Graham Bolton Planning Partnership Ltd	SB
Andrew Kirby	Northern Transport Ltd rep D & J Leitherd	AK
David Leitherd	D & J Leitherd	DL
John Leitherd	D & J Leitherd	JL

Continuation of Morning Session	
SJP	<p>Employment site and Whinney Hill Link Road to still discuss before moving on to Great Harwood and Rishton.</p> <p>Requires update from Lancs Minerals and Waste examination. What does Lancs M&W DPD say about Leitherd and Omega Atlantic Sites. Local Plan site enlarged to enclose Altham Lane to prevent green belt land becoming isolated.</p> <p>Ran through site history and general overview of the area. Former Power Station 22 Hectare. Altham Lane site 5.6 Hectare. Strategic employment site links to Pennine Lancashire Spatial Strategy which notes it's a strategically located site. Genecon Study noted potential to be a prestige site. Presence of power lines. The aim is to develop it for high value employment investment</p>
SP	for knowledge industry, manufacturing, Aerospace etc
SJP	Not just an industrial estate

SP	Assess needs for that type of development nearer time.
SJP	Consistent with Pennine Lancs work. Would meet employment needs of Hyndburn. Not split between 2 authorities like Whitebirk. Counted whole of site as part of supply. How does it square with County's proposals for Waste Technology Park and now waste development?. Now not an overriding need for this facility much reduced facility occupying 11 Hectare rather than 14 Hectare previously. Reduced facility, how would the building which managed waste fit with a high value employment investment.
SP	Planning Permission for waste technology park as well as a high value business park so felt they could co-exist with a road separating them. On face doesn't sound compatible but site large and can provide separation.
SJP	Policy A8 development of a strategic development site with a waste technologies park. Expired Planning Permission so may need to review wording to was. Look at re-wording Policy A11.
JM	Email from Louise Nurser suggests alternative terminology. Shouldn't refer to WTP as permission expired. Policy WM2 refers to different wording. Should be Large scale built waste management facility.
TR	Provided update on Lancashire M&W examination. Inspector accepted capacity gap had not been identified, County over provided allocations. Would it be harmful to remove Huncoat site from allocations. Discussion on site allocations including BWF8 will be on Thursday.
SJP	Plan needs to be consistent with M&W plan. Let Council know outcome from Thursday. If proposal in Site Allocation Mineral and Waste was to delete Waste development from Huncoat then Core Strategy should reflect it.
SP	We are in a difficult position. Need to be consistent with Lancashire approach but need to meet needs of Hyndburn.
SJP	Consider rewording to large scale waste facilities. Other alternative would be to delete all references to waste facilities. Would you (TR) agree that CS retains reference to waste facilities if that is conclusion of M&W DF.
TR	Does not want reference to waste facility but would accept if M&W examination concludes it should. Position completely changed.
SJP	Strategic Employment Site B1, B2 & B8 plus some waste development facility.
TR	No need to refer to waste development if county policies change.
SJP	May open door to other uses. What would councils view be. Suggested alternative policy wording:

	<p>“The Development of a strategic employment site , including B1, B2 and B8 and build waste management facilities will be supported”.</p> <p>If LCC say no need for waste management the reference to build waste management facilities can be deleted. Some councils don’t consider waste management as a specific class and could be included as a B1, B2 and B8 usage.</p> <p>Council to look again at detailed wording of Policy B8 to take account of LCC position of 15th August. Find out what is going on and get exact up to date position and revise policy and text including make sure references to Waste Technology Park are historical and purpose of Whinney Hill Link.</p>
TR	Clarified BWF8 covers 2 areas and have asked for our site to be removed.
SJP	Should be clear at end of hearing what plan will look like so can ensure consistency so no need to wait for Inspector’s Report. Land south of former Power Station Site, not part of original Waste Technology Park – does it have planning permission?
SP	Yes - Access off a road that doesn’t exist.
SJP	Land included in employment land figures. Reflect M&WDPD in Plan.
SP	Employment usage and some enabling.
SJP	Representors would like specific reference to some enabling development. Is it still case that Council is opposed to this.
TR	Suggested alternative policy wording - including but not limited to B1, B2 and B8.
SP	Concerned about opening door to other development that isn’t desirable but will look at it and see if can come up with mutually agreed wording.
SJP	Reference to enabling development may be too far.
TR	Could be referred to in supporting text.
JM	LCC have also suggested wording for A8 which needs to be considered. Council made in proposed change but no common ground between representors.
TR	The ‘and/or’ has been there.
JM	Reference to Waste Technology Park was an oversight and needs changing. Past phrase and shouldn’t be using.
SJP	Summary - if don’t need planned capacity, don’t need the site. Why shouldn’t the site be considered for some sort of waste facility . 11 Hectare at Huncoat and Whinney Hill. Omega capacity is overstated. PPS10 waste management

	plan should identify sites for waste facilities. Would plan be unsound if identified site is available for waste facilities.
TR	Failure of CPO makes it unsound.
SJP	CPO looked at Waste Technology Park not just waste facility. Because of capacity no need to identify site if need could go on Industrial site to accommodate waste management facility. Basis of argument. Waste management facility should not be included. Also Whinney Hill Link Road, main purpose to serve Whinney Hill quarry and landfill not to serve development site.
SJP	How would you get access to your site?
TR	By a link road to Burnley Road roundabout and are willing to pay for part of it because principle beneficiary is to alleviate tip/quarry traffic who would use it once pahse 2 is completed. .
SJP	All lorries directed to use new link road. Alleviate environmental conditions.
TR	With link road no cap on number of trips.
SJP	LCC were going to be main contributor to development of road, now not going to fund?
TR	As far as aware, funding not there. Latest position local transport plan draft implementation plan, link road significant development. Hyndburn and Lancashire work with developers to provide link road. (reference 15 th August email).
SJP	Read out Lancashire's response (same email). No help on who will provide it and who will fund it.
TR	Phase 1 suggested provided by developers but will have wider benefits.
SJP	Both plans need to be consistent. 4.2 Whinney Hill Link Road but doesn't explain how it will be provided.
TR	Committee Report 11 th March 2009 but included in paperwork. Proportionally Lancashire and other bodies who would benefit should provide funds.
SJP	CPO for Waste Technology Park failed. Does LCC accept that only part of CPOs approved was phase 2. Department of Transport position is ambiguous.
AGC	referred to June 2011 Para 2.25 Page 11 Huncoat Topic Paper quote from CPO Inspector's report.
AK	Countryside Development will be willing to contribute Omega willing to contribute plus AK's clients.

	<p>Faced with uncertainty on future land uses. Section 7.8 Huncoat Topic paper – local authority has role to play in facilitating development. Will there be sufficient money to deliver link road? Keep 2 phases - phase 1 at £2 million, phase 2 is more expensive.</p> <p>Need for flexibility to development to Huncoat package. Possibility for enabling development in supporting text.</p>
SP	<p>Proposed minor change to Huncoat Topic Paper. Para 2.23. Describes CPOs, WTP and access to A6719. New text to Altham Lane.</p> <p>Clarified with Secretary of State. Confirmed text change from “Bolton Ave to Altham Lane”</p>
TR	<p>Only phase 2 was confirmed.</p>
SJP	<p>Position on link road, amendments on Whinney Hill Link road are they needed to make it technically correct.</p>
TR	<p>Looking for amendments to A9. delete reference to Huncoat Strategic Employment Site and Bolton Avenue</p>
TR	<p>Recognise it would serve quarry and not just employment site.</p>
SJP	<p>Correct A9 not A8? Issue in Policy and Text recognises link to Quarry.</p>
SP	<p>As matter of fact link road does not actually go to Quarry or Landfill site. Have consistently said strategic employment site needs dedicated access. Borough sees it different from county. Important to have link to employment site. Got to be recognised new roads do confer wider public benefit and it can be engineered to reduce traffic in other areas. Development at Huncoat not sufficient to raise funds for entire development of Link Road.</p> <p>Important road is constructed in two phases 2nd phase at a later date. County Council no longer have a budget to fund the road. Work on viability and is there a gap that needs funding. County Council have a lot of knowledge of area. Agreed to work with them to use knowledge collected.</p>
SJP	<p>Don't show reference to Phase 2 on extract proposal map. Why only show phase one on plan?</p>
AGC	<p>P.8 on 2.12 Huncoat Topic Paper shows only phase 1. P.10 shows 2 different links to route 2.</p>
SP	<p>Key diagram shows entire length. Appendix shows proposed road. Omission on Plan will be corrected.</p>
SJP	<p>Reference to Waste Technology Park has been removed. Do revisions meet concerns? 5.44 of Core Strategy onwards. Talks about benefits of link road for landfill site. Does it go far enough?</p>

	Does not refer to Lancashire providing any funds for Phase 1 but does say developer does.
SJP	Are there any constraints on Whinney Hill Tip/Quarry operating?
TR	No but will be hindered in long term. As existing planning permission restricts number of vehicles which will be lifted if link road is built.
SP	Whinney Hill ancient permission until 2042, likely will continue as dependant on extraction of local shale. Brickworks still there but mothballed.
SJP	All necessary changes to A9 have been made.
SP	Mentioned in Draft Implementation Plan no funding from LCC.
TR	No Question to phase 1 being deliverable.
SJP	Housing site under phase 1, phase 2 not required for Huncoat Colliery site.
SP	Just safeguarding land.
SJP	Phase 2 not required to allow release any of the Huncoat proposals.
SP	Majority of Phase 2 not required can release the whole colliery site without phase 2 being completed.
SB	Access from Enfield Road is a possibility. A number of options. Would be convenient to have phase 2 but not essential.
AGC	For sake of feelings of being trodden on would get permission for phase 2 before phase 1 was built.
RC	Money for phase 2, lot of money raised by Quarry and landfill so deliverable if those concerned have the will, concerned about LCC backing GH.
SP	Difficulty on securing funds. Phase 1 deliverable in short term and benefits employment and housing site. Phase 2 have to be considered.
TR	Policy A9, route of road Lancashire would like relates to a specific scheme. Could A9 clarify coming forward in 2 phases as phase 2 may not be built.
SJP	Council comments
SP	Paragraph proposed does clarify 2 phases. No provision for rebate if phase 2 is completed.
TR	Can criteria be met if just phase 1 is delivered. Can criteria B & C be satisfied if only phase 1.
SP	Policy about entire link road, text explains 2 phases. Cannot implement measures to limit HGVs so part could be sought in Part 1.

SP	Seek package of measures as part of whole scheme. Part would be required with Phase 1.
	Sure text provides adequate explanation. Confirmation of 2 phases in text just not in plan.
SJP	Moved from Strategic employment to Whiney Hill Link road.
	Phasing for Whiney Hill in second 5 years.
	Land contamination of site.
AK	Greenfield site, overhead pylons can be dealt with in layout design phase.
SJP	SPD more flesh on the bones.
SP	Undertaken with local community.
AR	Who pays for SPD
SP	May seek contributions from developers and LCC.
SJP	Exceptional circumstances for removal of green belt given.
SP	Need to program in a viability study with landowners to discuss proposals.
AGC	Contamination only referred to administrative building burial of asbestos on site. Thought a considerable problem.
TR	Obtained reports for commercial and industrial use,
KD	Confirmed asbestos limited to administration block, no contamination on site. No buried asbestos on site. Will draw up plans
SP	Environmental Impact Assessment for WTP undertaken but would see a contaminated land study for any developments and take forward with Environment Agency and ascertain if remediation is adequate.
SJP	What development do you envisage on the site
TR	Viable commercial development deliver job for local community, viability and flexibility are fundamental. Draft NPPF, Secretary of State gives little weights to its policies.
AK	Financial viability, prestige strategic development, quality development. Important opportunities to refresh discussions with Council and identify an appropriate mix.
	Matter 7 B Great Harwood
SJP	GH1 and GH2 Policies in plan of 3200 new houses about 15%, 480 new

	<p>dwellings (not 2,400 in Council's statement) will be in Great Harwood. Does SHLAA identify suitable site.</p>
JM	<p>P9 Housing Topics Para 3.22 data suggests 1,054 dwellings to meet a need of 480.</p>
SJP	<p>Are there any strategic allocations in GH or sites outside urban area?</p>
FR	<p>All sites are within the urban area. Some are redevelopment of existing employment sites.</p> <p>No strategic allocations in Great Harwood.</p>
SJP	<p>Any consideration for housing balanced with employment?</p>
JM	<p>Slightly increased housing provision for Great Harwood - see table on page 4 of Matter 5 which was updated from Housing Topic Paper. Mid 2009 estimate % of population in Great Harwood is 13% suggesting housing provision of 15% of overall figure for borough.</p> <p>Slightly increased to sustain town.</p>
SJP	<p>GH2 Town Centre Policy, historic market town providing key local services. We have supermarket retail assessments and 2005 retail study.</p>
JM	<p>Tesco under construction and Aldi completed. More akin to a Market Town than a District Centre. Historic market town.</p>
SJP	<p>Is there a market?</p>
DM	<p>There is one stall outside the Town Hall.</p>
SJP	<p>2 Area based policies and other policies relevant to Great Harwood. 2 Statements from David Mason. Asked to explain what is unsound in core strategy and how to make sound.</p>
DM	<p>Core Strategy diminishes potential of Great Harwood, inaccuracies in text about town's accessibility. Doesn't doubt 480 houses can be accommodated. Issue is most housing sites on developed industrial land and where do displaced business go.</p>
SJP	<p>Mill sites- are they occupied.</p>
DM	<p>Some are, some are not</p>
SJP	<p>How do you know employment uses will use mills?</p>
DM	<p>Quality of sites and displacement of businesses.</p>
SJP	<p>Summarised concerned about location of housing development –most SHLAA sites in urban area . Matter discussed at Site Allocations DPD. Won't be making recommendations about individual sites.</p> <p>Confirms there are no strategic Housing or Employment Sites in Great Harwood. Summarised issue: concern about displacement of employment and businesses currently in mills.</p>
DM	<p>Tesco's taken a large site in GH, Metflex relocated in Great Harwood. Aldi on vacant site, old railway station.</p>

	Area of change - Could be recreation designation. Should be no housing in proximity to an Abattoir – could re-open. Area could be retained as employment sites.
SJP	Specific protection of sites to be included in SADPD.
DM	Balford Street, Wood Street would include Greenfield sites.Owns land to the north of Great Harwood – Greenfield – CS curtails possibilities. Description is incorrect, Pennine Reach incorrect, text diminishes industrial base of Great Harwood, Great Harwood not a threat it is an asset and should be reflected. Restrictive text is subjective rather than evidence based.
SJP	Elected members have agreed the strategy.
DM	Text diminished overall scope, expansion and potential of Great Harwood
SJP	Are you speaking as individual or representative, who do you represent?
DM	Represent CAG and Regen Board.
SJP	People agreed to Balance Development Strategy.
DM	Been involved since 2005 so have a social development conscience. Legacy of being a Councillor.
SJP	Did a significant number of people make representations that don't want constraints on developments?
DM	If HBC want Great Harwood to become a dormant Town then it needs to say so. The Industrial Heritage will go. The industrial base is mixed. Majority small business some large. Most small businesses will be displaced. Maintain industrial heritage. Not a Market Town has one stall on a Friday. Industrial base from 19-20 Mills Great Harwood needs an area action plan. Against development brief. Whole Town needs an holistic vision of its own. Sites allocated will be restricted on viability of type. Age provision. Social Housing deemed not to be necessary in Great Harwood as sufficient amount of low cost housing.
SJP	Neighbourhood Plan suggested is the new thing to go for.
SP	Council considering doing SADPD on an area basis including Great Harwood.
DM	Great Harwood gets nothing though 5 th most deprived ward.
SJP	If core strategy make requirement for an AAP for Great Harwood would be inconsistent.
	Talk about GH1 & GH2, horse has bolted. All ask for Great Harwood not to

	be diminished and an AAP is possible.
DM	Council has made some changes.
SP	<p>Worked with Elected members, including DM as previous member, tried to address some concerns, others are more difficult. Problem of relationship between Great Harwood and Hyndburn, also addressed relationship with Ribble Valley. Recognise Great Harwood and Rishton both contained by Green Belt both have town centres.</p> <p>Commitment to Neighbourhood Plans. Next project after this going to consult on Neighbourhood Plans through Area Councils.</p> <p>Area of change to East of Tesco's, believe had potential to provide some development needs. Constrained by 2 gasometers - recently decommissioned. Abattoir was mothballed and planning permission granted for houses. Necessary for Council to open discussion with abattoir to move to a more acceptable site.</p> <p>Housing: the SHLAA identified significant housing for Great Harwood. Lot of land to choose from. Seek to ensure appropriate balance of sites.</p> <p>Point on employment, new site in town being looked at through employment land study.</p> <p>Recognise Great Harwood as important for different employment use. Connectivity from south not particularly good. Hare and Hounds junction often congested and poor air quality issues. Almost an AQMA hence looking at different uses for area.</p> <p>Core Strategy recognises deprived status of area, but not subject to money available.</p> <p>Don't think an AAP would be suitable for Great Harwood. PPS12 states should be for areas of significant change or conservation Core Strategy looking at a development brief.</p>
JM	Other policies of plan also apply to Great Harwood. i.e. E1 or E2. E2 footnote list major industrial estates and includes Heys Lane Industrial Park. Thematic Policies of the Plan also cover Great Harwood.
DM	<p>Disturbed that administration plan refers to Hyndburn and GH is less accessible.</p> <p>It is accessible, 5 minutes from M65.</p> <p>No mention of Bus Services through Great Harwood to Manchester.</p> <p>Planning Permission for Housing is unsuitable due to presence of abattoir.</p> <p>Gasometers are a super grid area.</p> <p>Displacement of employment is a serious consideration. Great Harwood needs quantitative work and an assessment of need to be included in Core Strategy.</p>

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

SP	<p>Greenbelt sites can be released on justification.</p> <p>Leads people down wrong road. It's a jewel and should be allowed to expand.</p> <p>Agree Pennine Reach very important.</p> <p>Good news that there is interest to develop in Great Harwood.</p> <p>Aldi store granted planning permission against officer recommendation and is now built.</p>
SJP	<p>Will consider carefully everything that has been said..</p>