

<p>Matter 9: Huncoat Garden Village</p> <p>Issue 9: Has the Plan been positively prepared and is it justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of its policies and proposals for Huncoat garden Village? (NB. The Highway Impacts of the proposal on J8 M65 are considered under Matter 6)</p>		
<p>Policy SP2 Huncoat Garden Village</p>	<p>1. What exceptional circumstances are there to justify the release of land in the Green Belt for this development? Have all other reasonable options for alternative sites been examined fully? What compensatory work is proposed and how would it improve environmental quality and accessibility?</p>	<p>The exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt for Huncoat Garden Village are set out in the exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release (HBC8.004) and within the Councils response to Matter 3 Question 1, Question 2 and Question 3.</p> <p>The response to potential compensatory work is set out in the exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release (HBC8.004) paper and further information is provided in response to Matter 3 Question 9.</p>
	<p>2. The site is in multiple ownership. Has any Development Agreement been prepared to coordinate the development and secure its delivery?</p>	<p>As noted in the Councils response to IQ11a (H002) there is not an over-arching Development Agreement for HGV. The Council is co-ordinating delivery and liaising with landowners and house builders to secure deliver of HGV. All landowners where house building is proposed have indicated their support for the project and confirmed that they will bring forward their land for development.</p> <p>Since the Council’s response to IQ11a, there has been two updates to sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huncoat Power Station Site – Further pre-application discussions have taken place. • Former Colliery Site – Lovell Homes has been selected as the preferred house builder and Heads of Terms with Lovell Homes have been agreed.
	<p>3. What evidence is there to demonstrate the site is deliverable in the timescales anticipated?</p>	<p>The Council has provided further information in responses to IQ11a and IQ11b (H002).</p> <p>The Council has engaged with land owners and house builders since 2019. All landowners where house building is proposed have indicated their support and intention to develop housing.</p> <p>Several house builders are actively engaged and interested in developing housing including McDermott Homes (agreed terms with Clowes for the former Powers Station site which is subject to an outline application), and the former colliery site owners have agreed terms with Lovell Homes. Other house builders are actively showing an interest in developing new homes include Vistry, Persimmons and Keepmoat.</p>

		<p>Homes England are satisfied that the infrastructure works will be concluded by approximately March 2028 (this is evidenced by awarding circa £30m grant infrastructure funding for the HGV project). The phasing and delivery programme show an average 80-100 new homes to be built at Huncoat over the Plan period.</p>
	<p>4. How much of the development is likely to take place outside the Plan period? Should this be indicated in the supporting text for effectiveness?</p>	<p>The currently identified phasing of the Huncoat garden village was set out in response to IQ11b (H002). This indicates that 791 homes would be likely to take place outside the plan period (including on areas currently identified for safeguarded land). The council note that this takes a cautious reflection on development build out rates and suggests that up to 100 per annum could be achieved instead of the reflected 80 per annum.</p> <p>The Council considers that Policy SP2 identifies that some housing development at Huncoat Garden Village will take place outside the plan period and the housing delivery at Huncoat during the plan period is reflected in the housing trajectory, therefore the Council does not believe that there needs to be specific reference in the supporting text for effectiveness. The Council considers given the potential increase in build out rates that there may be less that the figure identified to be completed after the plan period.</p>
	<p>5. Grant funding with Homes England had been secured for the new relief road, associated land acquisition, remediation of the power station and colliery sites and a contribution to M65 J8 improvements. Will there be a need for any additional grant funding? What evidence is there that the scheme is viable?</p>	<p>The Council is using a two stage tender process to select a lead contractor for the relief road and to determine the tender price. Stage one of the process has been concluded resulting in Eric Wright Civil Engineering Limited has been selected has the lead contractor and the initial tender price is significantly within budget (this cannot be shared due to commercial confidentiality).</p> <p>The Council has obtained red book valuations for the required land for the relief road which shows land acquisition costs should be met within budget.</p> <p>Remediation grant for the two brownfield sites is a fixed grant and therefore the landowners (and house builder partners) are fully aware of this. Any additional costs for land remediation will be met by the landowners/developers and therefore no further grant will be required for this cost.</p> <p>The above three points mean we are confident that no further grant funding is required.</p>

		<p>The Council's Business Case to Homes England shows that the scheme is viable subject to the circa £30m grant funding. This has been independently reviewed and approved by Homes England's advisors. The information held within the Council's Business Case to Homes England is considered commercially confidential and therefore cannot be shared</p>
	<p>6. What progress has been made with the delivery of the Relief Road? Are there any constraints to its delivery?</p>	<p>The Council refers to the response in Matter 9, Question 5 for information of the contractor procurement.</p> <p>The Council has appointed Arcadis for the Planning application. A full planning application has been prepared and submitted and is currently under consideration (reference 11/25/0124). There is no significant planning constraints identified that are believed to preclude the delivery of the relief road subject to appropriate mitigation. Arcadis have also been commissioned to do a RIBA Stage 4 design for the proposed road and this is ongoing.</p> <p>The Council has engaged with all land owners regarding land assembly and the council has cabinet approval to make the initial steps to secure a CPO should any land owner not agree to dispose of their land for the road. Therefore, the Council do not consider that there are any land ownership constraints to the delivery of the relief road.</p> <p>The Council also have funding identified through the Homes England Grant fund for the delivery of the relief road. Therefore the Council does not consider that there are any funding issues precluding the delivery of the relief road.</p>
	<p>7. The Policy requires provision to be made for an extension to Huncoat Primary School. Is this requirement appropriate and justified?</p>	<p>Yes, the requirement is appropriate and justified. The Council would refer to the response to IQ11g (H002) in the initial questions and to the evidence set out in the Statement of Common Ground with Lancashire County Council Education department (H016) which refers to the councils position in paragraphs 2.13 – 2.17.</p>
	<p>8. Should the policy be more flexible to make provision for a new school on the site should changing circumstances suggest this is required? Where could a new school be located within the site? Is the policy and /or supporting text, effective in outlining how this would be achieved?</p>	<p>The Council does not believe that the policy needs to provide specific flexibility for a new school. The Council considers that, as outlined in paragraphs 2.16 and 2.17 of the SoCG with Lancashire County Council that even if the expansion of Huncoat Primary school was unable to occur there is availability within the wider Accrington PPA that could flexibly accommodate any changing circumstances.</p>

		<p>Should a new school be required it is unclear as to where this could be located. As identified in the SoCG the Council do not believe that developing a new school adjacent to Huncoat Primary School would be ideal considering the catchments of the schools, cost and inefficiencies in local service delivery.</p>
	<p>9. Part 1 of Policy SP2 requires that developers 'are expected to follow' the Huncoat Village Masterplan and Design Code? What is the current status of the Design Code? Is it clear to developers, decision makers and the community what is expected of them? Should development rigidly 'follow' or 'have regard' to these non-statutory documents? What if there are technical or viability issues which mean the requirements are not achievable?</p>	<p>The current Huncoat Village Masterplan and Design Code has been adopted by the Council at full council. The document is however at this time a non-statutory document. The Council propose to adopt the Masterplan and Design Code as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) following the adoption to the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council proposes a main modification to Part 1 of Policy SP2:</p> <p><i>Huncoat Garden Village (HGV) is a strategic location for housing growth. The Garden Village will provide a transformational development scheme for the Borough, delivering and supporting a high quality, sustainable community in line with design standards to be adopted for the area These design standards will be set out in the Huncoat Garden Village Masterplan and the Huncoat Design Code, both of which developers are expected to follow <u>have regard to</u>.</i></p>
	<p>10. In part 3f) of the Policy what is meant by clean vehicular travel options? Is this requirement effectively worded?</p>	<p>The reference to clean vehicular travel options is used as an umbrella term relating to the use of electric vehicles, including cars, buses and other vehicles as well as potential shared modes of transport including car clubs as examples. This is also specifically related to the charging infrastructure required. The Council believes that it is reasonable to include this policy wording as it ensures that these principles are integrated into the development and helps the plan be consistent with our requirements under Section 19(A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004).</p>
	<p>11. Is the wording of the Policy repetitive in requiring the management and maintenance of infrastructure (eg. in part 3h), part 4, part 8d, g and f, part 9 a-d)?</p>	<p>The Council has written the policy in this way to provide a clear requirement on the future management and maintenance of infrastructure. The Council do however accept that this creates repetition. The Council propose that if the inspector is minded to make modifications to ensure soundness that the clause should be kept in part 4 of the policy and removed for other references within the policy.</p>
	<p>12. Part 7 of the Policy states that development should 'work towards zero net carbon' Is it clear what this means for the development? Is this part of the policy effectively worded? Has scheme viability been considered?</p>	<p>This part of the policy is designed to encourage development to work towards net zero and is not a requirement of policy to achieve net zero. The Council has looked at the potential costs of achieving net zero through the Viability study (HBC2.006) this is set out in paragraphs 8.29 – 8.32 but are not considering to take these forward as policy requirements.</p>

		<p>The Council would expect that applications that show development beyond building regulations and working towards net zero as shown in the policy would be looked upon more favourably. The Council would expect that developers would highlight this through an Energy Statement. This aligns with our requirements under Section 19(A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Council will expect development to accord with the requirements set out in Policy SP13, which have been assessed through the whole plan viability assessment.</p>
	<p>13. Part 8 c) of the policy refers to ‘off site’ drainage solutions. What are these and how would they be secured?</p>	<p>The reference of ‘off site’ drainage solutions is considered to provide opportunities to ensure that SuDs requirements can take consideration of requirements upstream of the proposed developments, this is set out in the Huncoat Garden Village Masterplan framework on page 85.</p> <p>The Council would expect applications, in the first instance, to accord with the requirements set out in part 8 h, I and J.</p> <p>The Council would expect any ‘off-site’ drainage solutions to be secured through a S106 agreement at the planning application stage.</p>
	<p>14. Part 9d) requires creative landscaping schemes, planting of trees and grass verges etc. in accordance with the requirements of the Masterplan and Design Code. Given the status of these documents should the development have regard to their principles rather than being strictly in accordance with it?</p>	<p>The Council proposes a main modification to part 9d of Policy SP2:</p> <p><i>Develop a streetscape that extends the green infrastructure into the Garden Village with creative landscaping schemes, planting of trees and grass verges alongside roads, landscaping of public and private spaces in accordance with <u>having regard to the requirements of the HGV Masterplan and the Design Code, including arrangements for their future maintenance.</u></i></p>
	<p>15. Paragraph 3.27 of the Plan refers to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for the site. The Masterplan already includes an infrastructure Schedule and Development Costings. Is it clear who will prepare the IDP, when they will do this and how will it be kept up to date?</p>	<p>The Council is preparing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for Huncoat Garden Village. Avison Young have been appointed to support the Council with preparing, monitoring and updating the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Huncoat Garden Village. This work was first done for the Masterplan, but is now being updated.</p>