

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
Matter 2: The Vision and Spatial Development Strategy Issue 2.1: Is the Plan's overall vision and strategy positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy in enabling the delivery of sustainable development.		
Vision and Strategic objectives	1. Are the vision and strategic objectives justified by the evidence and do they reflect the issues and challenges facing the Borough?	<p>Yes, the Council considers that the vision and strategic objectives are justified by evidence included within the submission plan, including the IIA (HBC2.010a) and HENA (HBC2.003a and HBC2.003b) and reflect the issues and challenges that face the borough. The Council believes that the justification for the vision and objectives is adequately set out in the supporting text to the vision as well as each of the strategic objectives identified in the plan at Chapter 2.</p> <p>The Council reflects that there could be a strengthening of the recognition of conserving and enhancing the historic environment to ensure better compliance with the requirements of the NPPF. The Council has proposed main modifications to the vision in response to Matter 2, Question 2.</p>
	2. Should the Vision for Hyndburn seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment of the Borough?	<p>Yes, the Council propose a main modification to the vision in paragraph 2.1 to read:</p> <p><i>In 2040 Hyndburn will be a vibrant, distinctive, and prosperous area of Pennine Lancashire. It will be recognised for the collective quality and attractiveness of its market towns, its diverse communities, its landscape setting, environmental credentials, including a <u>high quality built and historic environment</u>, a healthy natural environment and its response to climate change, and the special qualities of Huncoat Garden Village.</i></p> <p>The Council believe that the proposed modification would better reflect requirements to seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment of the Borough in line with requirements in the NPPF.</p>
	3. The supporting text to Strategic Objective 4 refers to the heritage assets in the Borough. Does the Strategic Objective adequately recognise their importance?	<p>Yes, the Council considers that the strategic objective 4 is sound in relation to recognising the importance of heritage in the borough. The strategic objective is '<i>to conserve and,</i></p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p><i>where appropriate, enhance a valued urban and rural environment</i>'. This is compliant with NPPF paragraph 8(c).</p> <p>The Council considers that when read alongside paragraphs 2.25, 2.28, 2.29 and 2.31 of the Local Plan this adequately reflects the strategic importance of heritage in the borough in relation to objective 4. However, the addition of specific reference to heritage would add further clarity. The Council proposes the following main modification:</p> <p><i>To Conserve and, where appropriate, enhance a valued urban, and rural <u>and heritage</u> environment that is ready to address the causes and effects of climate change</i></p>
Policy SP1	4. Is the spatial strategy appropriate and justified taking into account reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence?	<p>Yes. The spatial strategy directs growth to the main urban areas (Accrington, Oswaldtwistle, Rishton, Clayton-Le-Moors, Great Harwood and Huncoat) reflecting the established settlement hierarchy within the borough. This approach focuses development to areas where services, transport links and infrastructure capacity exist, minimising reliance on unsustainable travel and protecting rural areas.</p> <p>Reasonable alternatives have been adequately considered through the IIA process and within the growth options and spatial options justification paper (H015), with table 13 providing an overview of the assessment of the five spatial options and reasoned justification provided in the supporting text at paragraphs 4.24 – 4.30 for the Council's preferred spatial option which will achieve the sustainable patterns of growth.</p>
	5. Is the Policy consistent with the Framework, is it justified, and would it be effective?	<p>The Council considers Policy SP1 to be both justified and effective. The policy is supported by the assessments of reasonable alternatives undertaken in the IIA, which provided a comprehensive and robust assessment of each of the reasonable alternatives. The conclusion of this assessment and the Council's rationale for the selected growth options and spatial strategy are set out in the growth and spatial options justification paper (H015).</p> <p>The policy is also underpinned by evidence on housing and employment land needs, through the HENA (2021) and Green Belt Assessment (HBC2.001) and background paper</p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p>on exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release (HBC8.004), which present the evidence to justify the spatial strategy set out in Policy SP1.</p> <p>The policy aligns with the NPPF paragraph 11. It allocates a sufficient number of homes and employment land to meet the identified need and attributes this in a sustainable pattern as identified through the evidence.</p>
	<p>6. Does the Growth Strategy for Altham take sufficient account of the proposed expansion of Altham Business Park? Is there any contradiction?</p>	<p>Yes, the growth strategy recognises Altham Business Park as a key economic location through the allocation of EMP3 for expansion. This is due to the key location of the site to the M65 corridor. Policy SP1 ensures that growth complements the proposed employment use rather residential development. Policy SP1 identifies the Huncoat Garden Village proposals as the main growth strategy for housing which is within reasonable distance of the Altham employment allocation with Policy EP1 requiring the development of sustainable transport links from Altham Business Park to the HGV development and Policy SP2 (and the HGV Masterplan) requiring the provision of sustainable means of transport including public transport, pedestrian route and cycle ways.</p> <p>Therefore, Altham's identification as a village within the settlement hierarchy is not considered to be in contradiction to the proposed employment growth at EMP3.</p>
	<p>7. The Policy states that the existing settlement pattern and hierarchy will be maintained. Did the Council review the settlement hierarchy as part of Plan preparation? If not, why not? Is the existing hierarchy justified?</p>	<p>The Council did not undertake a formal review of the settlement hierarchy as part of the plan preparation process. The established hierarchy has been developed over successive local plans and continues to reflect the roles, functions and capacities of different settlements across the borough. There has been no compelling evidence of significant change in settlement characteristics, infrastructure provision, or service accessibility that would necessitate a reclassification of the settlements.</p> <p>In preparing the plan the Council has reviewed a range of evidence relating to housing delivery, infrastructure capacity and accessibility to key services, including the IIA (HBC2.010a), IIA appendix 6 (HBC2.008g), SHLAA (HBC5.001a), SHLAA appendix (HBC5.001b) and Site assessment and selection background paper (HBC8.003). This supported the conclusions that the exiting hierarchy remains robust and justified as a framework for distributing growth in the borough in the most sustainable locations. The</p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		Council considers this approach to be proportionate, consistent with the principles within the NPPF and sound in the context of the Local Plans vision and objectives.
	<p>8. Are the settlement boundaries illustrated on the Policies Map justified?</p>	<p>The Council did not undertake a formal review of the settlement boundaries as part of the plan preparation process. The established boundaries have been adopted in the 2018 Development Management plan and continues to reflect the roles, functions and capacities of different settlements across the borough. There has been no compelling evidence of significant change in settlement characteristics that would necessitate a reclassification of the settlement boundaries aside from changes to account for sites released or added to the Green Belt and land previously designated as Areas of Special Restraint in the 1996 Hyndburn Local Plan that have since been approved for development.</p>
	<p>9. Does the spatial distribution of housing accord with the settlement hierarchy? Is it appropriate and justified, in particular,</p> <p>a. Should more housing be allocated in Great Harwood and Oswaldtwistle to support their future growth and ability to attract investment?</p> <p>b. Clayton-le-Moors is included within the top tier of the Settlement Hierarchy. What is the justification for it being allocated less housing than areas lower down the settlement hierarchy e.g. Rishton and Great Harwood?</p>	<p>Yes, the Council considers that the distribution of housing largely accords with the settlement hierarchy. The Council acknowledges that there are some discrepancies in the level of housing across settlements of different sizes. This is due to the allocation of sites requiring suitable, available and deliverable sites and therefore the decision to allocate specific sites requires a case-by-case basis assessment.</p> <p>The Council also recognise that there is an interlinked relationship between the housing growth and employment growth, with the proposed housing strategy being employment led. The Council's employment strategy has focused on releases of land along the M65 corridor, including the release of strategic employment land at Whitebirk and Altham. This aligns with the Pennine Growth Strategy and through the assessments set out in the Background paper for Employment relating to market demand (HBC8.002).</p> <p>Given these strategic employment locations and to align with the sustainable development principles as set out in NPPF paragraph 16(a). The Council has made a decision to distribute more housing to locations in closer proximity to strategic employment growth which includes both Huncoat and Rishton.</p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p>In relation to the specific settlement mentioned, the growth levels identified at Great Harwood and Oswaldtwistle are considered to be proportionate when considering wider environmental constraints (including green belt) and infrastructure capacities for the two settlements, such as the lack of a train station within either settlement boundary.</p> <p>Clayton-le-Moors, while a top tier settlement, has been identified for less housing due to concerns around overall air quality (IIA appendix 3 (HBC2.008d) page 98), effects of green belt release on coalescence of towns (Green Belt Assessment (HBC2.001) and potential transport implications around the hare and hound junction (Hare and Hound Junction technical note (HBC7.003)). This ensures that growth is deliverable and sustainable rather than purely driven by the settlement hierarchy.</p>
	<p>10. How does part 2 of the Policy, relating to development in rural areas, take into account paragraphs 84-85 of the Framework to support a prosperous rural economy? Rather than referencing the Framework, should the policy be more specific as to what this means for Hyndburn?</p>	<p>The Council consider that part 2 of Policy SP1 supports a prosperous rural economy. The Council consider it appropriate to reference the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that the policy meets the appropriate tests of soundness, specifically that it is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Council consider that Paragraphs 84 and 85 provide a clear national direction on supporting a prosperous rural economy, including sustainable growth and diversification rural businesses, promoting rural tourism and leisure and supporting local services and community facilities. These national principles are designed to be flexible and applicable across diverse local contexts and are considered to accurately reflect the variety of potential rural development within Hyndburn.</p> <p>It is also considered that directly referencing the NPPF reinforces that the Council's approach is in line with the wider planning system and maintains the benefit of a direct link to the national guidance.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council considers that further Local context is set out in Policy SP25 of the Local Plan, and the two policies should be read in conjunction with each other.</p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
Flood Risk	11. The Level 1 SFRA (HBC6.002a) makes a number of recommendations. Have these been followed and if not, what is the justification for this?	<p>Yes, the recommendations have been followed however in some cases they are better implemented at planning application stage. In some cases, their inclusion in Development Management policies would be more apt. This will be included when the Council moves on to the next version of its Local Plan. However, all of the recommendations are supported by current national policy and guidance.</p> <p>Recommendation 1: No development within the functional floodplain</p> <p>There are no proposals for development in the functional flood plain. If any sites are found to include small areas of Flood Zone 3 (i.e. EMP3, H11, H18) development will be directed away from these areas.</p> <p>Recommendation 2a: Consider surface water flood risk</p> <p>The Environment Agency have asked the Council to include the following text on the maps regarding fluvial and pluvial flood risk: <i>“the areas at risk of flooding in each of these sites should be removed from the developable area, unless it can be demonstrated, through a comprehensive site-specific FRA, that the flood risk can be overcome, and those parts of the site can be developed safely”</i>. The Council have removed the flood risk area as a precaution but acknowledge that innovative solutions may be found which enable development on a greater area, in some cases.</p> <p>Policy SP13 and the Huncoat Garden Village (“HGV”) site specific polices also provide guidance regarding the appropriate surface water flood management. Policy DM20 of the DM DPD sets out in more detail the approach that should be taken when considering flood risk and surface water drainage.</p> <p>Recommendation 2b: Use of SuDS</p> <p>Where appropriate, site specific policies mention the use of SuDS. Policy DM20 of the DM DPD sets out in more detail the approach that should be taken when considering SuDS in development.</p> <p>Recommendation 3: Sequential approach to site allocation and site layout</p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p>Yes, this has been considered through the SFRA and where appropriate through the development management process.</p> <p>Recommendation 4: Requirements for a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>Yes, the requirement is set out in Policy SP13 and the justification text states: “developer led site-specific flood risk assessments will be required as part of the planning application process for allocated sites to ensure that development fully addresses flood risk issues.”</p> <p>Policy DM20 of the DM DPD sets out in more detail the approach that should be taken in terms of Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Recommendation 5: Natural Flood Management (NFM) techniques</p> <p>Reference to NFM is made in the glossary and the supporting text for Policy SP14, para 7.27. This supports National Policy which states:</p> <p>“All plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development ... by... using opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding, (making as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques as part of an integrated approach to flood risk management);” (NPPF, Sep 2023).</p> <p>Recommendation 6: Phasing of development</p> <p>The strategic employment sites will be subject to a Masterplan which will address this issues. HGV will also be developed in phases and this should ensure that any sites at risk of causing flooding to other sites are developed first to ensure that flood storage measures are in place and operational before other sites are developed.</p>
	<p>12. Is there any evidence to indicate that the Council has failed to apply the sequential test and then if necessary, the exception test during preparation of the Plan?</p>	<p>The Council commissioned a Level 1 SFRA to initiate the sequential risk-based approach to the allocation of land for development and to identify whether application of the Exception Test is likely to be necessary to inform and provide the evidence base for the update to the Local Plan. This document contains all the information about the sequential approach (HBC6.002a-g).</p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p>The SFRA found a number of sites at risk of flooding. During the Reg 19 consultation, the Environment Agency (EA) raised an objection regarding these sites stating that in order to overcome their objection, a full assessment of the sites should be provided which must include either a redrawn site plan which excludes the area of Flood Risk, or a level 2 SFRA. In its response, the Council proposed that flood risk could be avoided by inserting site-specific policy wording to only locate development in low-risk areas within allocations, then the sequential test need not be applied.</p> <p>The EA agreed to this, stating it was satisfied that, with a revised map key and amendments to the map detail showing the areas of 0.1% or greater annual probability of surface and fluvial flooding, its outstanding concerns had been addressed. The EA requested that they were shown the revised maps showing both surface and fluvial flooding prior to submission of the plan for Examination (H004). Following this, the EA is satisfied with the allocations and policies in the Local Plan and the evidence base undertaken to support them.</p> <p>Please see the SFRA (HBC6.002a-g) and Consultation Statement (HBC10.001) for more information. There is no evidence that the Council has failed to apply the sequential test / exception test during preparation of the Plan.</p>
	13. Appendix D to the Plan provides flood risk maps for allocations. Is it clear what they are illustrating and how they should be used to guide development proposals?	These maps have been included at the request of the Environment Agency. A modification has been proposed and new, clearer maps were submitted to the Inspector to replace them as part of the Council's response to the initial questions (H004).
Rural Areas Policy SP25 Development in rural areas.	14. Is the policy effective, justified and consistent with national planning policy?	Yes, the Council considers that the policy is effective, justified and consistent with national planning policy. Policy SP25 allows for essential rural housing, rural business diversification and appropriate leisure and tourism use while balancing wider recognitions of the rural landscape. This is consistent with paragraph 84 of the NPPF and balances flexibility with safeguards against unsustainable development.
	15. Are parts 2 and 3) of the Policy consistent with paragraph 84 of the Framework?	Yes, the council considers that parts 2 and 3 of Policy SP25 are consistent with paragraph 84 of the NPPF. Part 2 of Policy SP25 is considered to provide support to the principles of part a of paragraph 84 of the NPPF. The policy ensures support for agricultural buildings that are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture or forestry, this is considered

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p>to enable sustainable growth and expansion of these types of businesses where they can evidence this purpose.</p> <p>Part 3 of Policy SP25 is considered to provide support for farm diversification and/or promoting outdoor leisure and recreational facilities, in line with part b of paragraph 84 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Furthermore, Policy SP25 part 3 states that <i>"In areas designated as Countryside Areas, there will be a general presumption against proposals for new development, unless they are in accordance with Policy SP1: The Spatial Development Strategy."</i></p> <p>Policy SP1 part 2 contains the following:</p> <p><i>"Development in rural areas outside the named settlements will be limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• that supporting farm diversification and promoting leisure and recreational facilities whilst retaining landscape character; or</i> <i>• that which is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework."</i> <p>Therefore, the council considers that Parts 2 and 3 of Policy SP25 are consistent with paragraph 84 of the NPPF.</p>
	16. Does part 5 of the Policy duplicate Policy SP1 6f)? Is it necessary in Policy SP25 for soundness?	Yes, the Council agrees that this is a duplication of Policy SP1 6f). The Council propose the deletion of part 5 of Policy SP25 for consistency.
<p>The Local Plan Areas</p> <p>Issue 2.2: Has the Plan been positively prepared and is it justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of its policies and proposals for individual local plan areas in Hyndburn?</p>		
<p>Policy SP26 Accrington</p>	1. Should the development strategy for Accrington recognise the presence of heritage assets including the Town Centre Conservation Area and require development proposals to have regard to its conservation and enhancement?	Yes. The site assessment and selection process sought to ensure the proposed allocations, including those in Accrington, were free from significant constraints [HBC2.004 Hyndburn HRA Screening Report; HBC5.001a SHLAA (2016); HBC5.001B SHLAA (2016), HBC8.003 Background Paper Site Assessment and Selection] and was supplemented by work undertaken as part of the Integrated Impact Assessment.

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed Housing Allocations referred to in this policy will require heritage impacts to be considered and addressed as part of the development proposals. The Plan's Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA – HBC6.005) and the HER Site Allocations Report and HER Heritage Assessment Spreadsheet (HBC6.003a and HBC6.003B) include an appraisal for designated and non-designated heritage assets, and recommendations for bringing forward development in sensitive locations.</p> <p>Although Policy SP19 provides an overarching commitment to the protection, management, and enhancement of the designated heritage and non-designated heritage assets, it is still important for each of the local plan area policies contained in Policy SP26 to acknowledge the presence of the designated Conservation Area and Listed Buildings and include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets. This statement should be specific to the character of this policy area and the heritage assets affected by developments.</p> <p>In response to the above, HBC accept that the area-based policies in Policy SP26 should include a clause regarding the expected treatment of heritage and non-designated heritage assets. Modifications are therefore proposed to Policy SP26 to ensure that the policy provide further details to support the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings, as detailed by paragraph 190 & 193 of the NPPF (September 2023).</p> <p>Proposed Modification:</p> <p><i>Policy SP26: Accrington (Central), Baxenden and Church</i></p> <p><i>1) Land is identified for delivery of 544 homes in Accrington (Central), Baxenden and Church over the plan period 2021-2040. This will be delivered through existing commitments and by the development of the following site allocations:</i></p> <p><i>a. H1 The Steel Works, Charter Street</i></p> <p><i>b. H2 Land at Charter Street, Accrington</i></p> <p><i>c. H3 Pendle Street, Accrington</i></p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p>d. H4 Land at Hopwood Street, Accrington e. H6 Union Works and Union Street Garage f. H7 Land north of Sandy Lane, Accrington</p> <p>Accrington (Central): 2) Alongside new housing provision, the Council will continue to support regeneration and grant schemes that help improve the quality and use of the existing housing stock in areas of high vacancy and low demand. 3) <u>Developments within Accrington are expected to be of distinctive quality and design and should preserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the conservation areas, listed buildings and their settings, areas containing or in proximity to a heritage asset (including non-designated heritage assets), and areas of high visual amenity.</u> 3) 4) The role of Accrington Town Centre as the strategic retail and service hub for the Borough will be consolidated and enhanced through new investment and town centre management over the plan period.</p> <p>Baxenden: 4) 5) Baxenden Neighbourhood Centre will be supported to continue its function providing basic, essential needs to local residents over the plan period.</p> <p>Church: 5) 6) Opportunities to regenerate the Church Oswaldtwistle Gateway area will be pursued in line with the adopted or revised Church Oswaldtwistle Gateway SPD. 6) 7) Church (Blackburn Road) Neighbourhood Centre will be supported to continue its function providing basic, essential needs to local residents over the plan period.</p> <p>Insertion to the supporting text: 10.9 The town centre developed rapidly in the industrial era and has a legacy of Victorian buildings, some of which are included in the town centre <u>Accrington Central Conservation Area</u>. Notable buildings include the Carnegie Library, the Town Hall, the Market Hall and the Victorian Arcade. <u>10.10 The area features three designated conservation areas (Accrington Central Conservation Area; Church Canal Side Conservation Area; and Christ Church Conservation</u></p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p><u>Area), Listed Buildings and non-designated heritage assets, providing a built heritage context that will influence future development proposals. Development proposals are expected to be accompanied by an appropriate evidence-based assessment of the heritage context to ensure that the impact of the proposals are clearly understood.</u></p>
<p>Policy SP28 Great Harwood</p>	<p>2. Should the development strategy for Great Harwood recognise the presence of heritage assets including the Town Centre Conservation Area and require development proposals to have regard to their conservation and enhancement?</p>	<p>Yes. Although Policy SP19 provides an overarching commitment to the protection, management, and enhancement of the designated heritage and non-designated heritage assets, it is still important for each of the local plan area policies contained in Policy SP28 to acknowledge the presence of the designated Conservation Area and Listed Buildings and include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets. This statement will be specific to the character of Great Harwood and the heritage assets affected by developments.</p> <p>In response to the above, HBC accept that this area-based policy of Great Harwood should include a clause regarding the expected treatment of heritage and non-designated heritage assets. Modifications are therefore proposed to the Policy SP28 to ensure that this policy provides further details to support the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings, as detailed by paragraph 190 & 193 of the NPPF (September 2023).</p> <p>Proposed Modification:</p> <p><i>Policy SP28: Great Harwood</i></p> <p>1) Land is identified for delivery of 336 homes in Great Harwood over the plan period 2021-2040. This will be delivered through existing commitments and other sites which are considered developable over the Plan period.</p> <p>2) Great Harwood Town Centre will continue to function as a historic market town providing key local services and specialist/local shopping facilities for the northern part of the Borough.</p> <p><u>3) Developments within Great Harwood are expected to be of distinctive quality and design and should preserve and enhance the special character and/or appearance of the Great Harwood Conservation Area, listed buildings and their settings, areas containing or in</u></p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		<p><u>proximity to a heritage asset (including non-designated heritage assets), and areas of high visual amenity.</u></p> <p>Insertion to the supporting text:</p> <p><u>10.36 Great Harwood is a town with an industrial heritage, containing a large number of historic landmarks and listed buildings evidencing the history of the town's cotton industry, and the Great Harwood Town Centre conservation Area. As such, account should be taken of the special architectural or historic interest of the Conservation Area, listed building and non-designated heritage assets, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. The relevant Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the opportunities for beneficial change or the needs for planning protection. Development proposals are expected to be accompanied by appropriate evidence-based assessment of the heritage context to ensure that impact of the proposals are clearly understood.</u></p>
<p>Policy SP29 Huncoat</p>	<p>3. Is the requirement in part 2 of the policy to 'adhere' to the Huncoat Garden Village Masterplan and Design Code too restrictive. Should development 'have regard' to these non-statutory documents?</p>	<p>Page 24, footnote 34 of the Plan confirms the Council's intention to adopt the Huncoat Design Code as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), at which stage it would form part of the development plan and carry full statutory weight.</p> <p>At present, however, the term "adhere to" in Part 2 of the policy may be considered overly rigid. It implies strict compliance, whereas the Council's intention has always been to allow for a degree of flexibility when assessing proposals against the Huncoat Garden Village Masterplan and Design Code.</p> <p>Until formal adoption as an SPD, it would be more appropriate to require development to "have regard to" or "be informed by" these documents, ensuring that they guide decision-making without requiring full conformity.</p> <p>Proposed Modification:</p> <p><u>2) For any proposals in the Huncoat Garden Village area, developers are expected to adhere have regard to the detailed policy considerations set out in Policy SP2 and the Huncoat Garden Village Masterplan and Design Code.</u></p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
	<p>4. In the interests of clarity and effectiveness, should part 4 of the policy set out where the new local centre is likely to be located?</p>	<p>It is considered that the requirement to 'adhere to' or 'have regard to' the Huncoat Garden Village Masterplan, as set out in Part 2 of Policy SP29, provides sufficient clarity regarding the proposed location of the new local centre, as identified within the masterplan document.</p>
	<p>5. The site allocations listed in the policy have the potential to generate significant vehicular movements. Part 5 of the Policy states that the required highways infrastructure must be operational no later than the occupation of the development for which it is required. Is this justified? Has an assessment been undertaken to understand what level of development, if any, could take place before the required infrastructure is operational?</p>	<p>No assessment has yet been carried out by the Council to determine the scale of development that could be accommodated at Huncoat Garden Village prior to the delivery of improvements to the Strategic Road Network (SRN). National Highways has carried out vehicular movement studies and testing and their current position is that no development should take place until it is satisfied that J8 can be improved and made safe to accommodate the increase in traffic and that the funding is in place to do the required works.</p> <p>An outline planning application for up to 360 dwellings at the Huncoat Power Station site — which forms part of the H12 Huncoat East Strategic Site (north) — is currently under consideration by the Council. However, the application is subject to a holding objection from National Highways. This is due in part to a lack of sufficient information within the application to enable a full assessment of the development's impact on the operation and safety of M65 Junction 8.</p> <p>Aside from the proposed upgrades to M65 Junction 8 — which are expected to be funded through National Highways' Road Investment Strategy (RIS3) — improvements are also planned at the A6068 / A678 Shuttleworth Mead junction. Any additional necessary enhancements to the SRN or local road network would be identified at the planning application stage and would be expected to be delivered through development contributions.</p> <p>It is recognised that occupation of homes at Huncoat Garden Village may be delayed if it becomes necessary to wait for the completion of highways improvements at M65 Junction 8 and the Shuttleworth Mead junction. The extent of any delay would depend on National Highways' delivery timescales for the M65 Junction 8 works. However, subject to the approval of RIS3 funding, it may be possible for development to begin ahead of the completion of these infrastructure improvements, provided this is managed through the</p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
		use of appropriate planning conditions that restricts the occupation of the development until any necessary mitigation is operational.
<p>Policy SP31 Rishton and Whitebirk</p>	<p>6. What is the justification for the 40% restriction on non-bulky goods retail and supporting ancillary uses at Hyndburn Retail Park?</p>	<p>Core Document HBC3.002a Retail Study (2016) highlights that the Peel Centre (Whitebirk) serves a complementary role within the local retail hierarchy, capturing a significant share of consumer expenditure in certain comparison goods sub-sectors within the borough.</p> <p>However, the Retail Study also acknowledges the risks associated with relaxing the existing restrictions at the retail park, particularly regarding the potential impact on the vitality and viability of the borough's designated town centres. These concerns are referenced in paragraph 7.10 of the report and paragraph 10.71 of HBC1.001 Local Plan Reg22 (2025) Submission Version</p> <p>The Peel Centre is the subject of a Section 106 Agreement dated 23rd June 2009 which restricts the range of goods that can be sold from various units at the retail park to protect nearby town centre vitality and viability. This allows for the retail sale of a range of bulky goods.</p> <p>In recent years, a series of amendments have been made to this Section 106 Agreement, allowing new retailers to occupy space at the Peel Centre. This has included food retailers like The Food Warehouse and Aldi, as well as variety retailers such as Home Bargains, both of which sell food and drink items.</p> <p>The Council suggest the following amendment to SP31 be considered:</p> <p><i>4) The Council will support the Peel Centre (Whitebirk) as a predominantly bulky goods retailing destination in the Borough, to complement the role of Town Centres and Local Centres in Hyndburn and Blackburn with Darwen. Non-bulky retailing and/or supporting ancillary uses to the retail park and strategic employment hub will be permitted though <u>these should not exceed 40% of the overall floorspace on the site subject to compliance with the requirements of Policy DM3 of the DM DPD in the determination of planning applications in accordance with sequential and impact test principles.</u></i></p>

Issue	Inspector's Question	Hyndburn Borough Council's Response
	7. Does the supporting text need to be amended to recognise that Hyndburn Retail Park is not simply or solely an 'out of centre' retail facility but provides a complimentary function adding to the commercial attractiveness of the planned employment allocations?	It is acknowledged that the retail and leisure facilities at Hyndburn Retail Park would, to some degree, complement the proposed employment allocations at Whitebirk. The Council is open to the inclusion of additional wording in the supporting text to reflect this relationship. However, it remains essential to ensure that sufficient protections are in place for designated town and local centres to safeguard their long-term vitality and viability (also see Council response to Matter 4, question 25).